

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, August 14, 1995
Volume 31—Number 32
Pages 1383–1437

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Black Enterprise magazine, 25th anniversary gala—1411
- Comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban—1432
- Environmental protection, Baltimore, MD—1393
- Progressive National Baptist Convention in Charlotte, NC—1401
- Radio address—1383
- Teenage smoking—1414, 1415

Bill Vetoes

- Bosnia arms embargo, statement—1433

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Community right-to-know initiatives, memorandum—1400
- Emerging democracies, memorandum—1425
- Mobile services antennas, memorandum—1424
- President's Oklahoma City Scholarship Fund, memorandum—1410

Executive Orders

- Federal Acquisition and Community Right-To-Know—1397

Interviews With the News Media

- Interviews
 - Bob Edwards and Mara Liasson of National Public Radio—1385
 - Tabitha Soren of MTV—1426
- News conference, August 10 (No. 101)—1415

Proclamations

- Minority Enterprise Development Week—1393
- National Child Support Awareness Month—1384

Statements by the President

- See also* Bill Vetoes
- Comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban—1432
- Welfare reform—1401

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—1437
- Checklist of White House press releases—1437
- Digest of other White House announcements—1434
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—1435

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, August 11, 1995

The President's Radio Address

August 5, 1995

Good morning. Today I'm at the Children's Inn at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, with young patients and their families, some of whom are guests of the inn. For them, the Children's Inn is home while their children get well. The inn is built on a simple premise, that even with the best doctors, medicine, and technology, no treatment is complete unless it includes the family.

Children know that better than anyone, that it's their mothers and fathers who carry them through the tough times. And that's true for all of us. But we all know, too, that our families all across America are going through tough times today. Right now, our families are feeling real pressure. Too many are working harder for less. Too many are afraid of losing their jobs or their retirement or their health care. Too many live in fear that their children are exposed to violence and drugs.

We have to do what we can to strengthen our families and to help them through these changing times. That's what we did with the very first law I signed as President, which took effect 2 years ago today. It's called the Family and Medical Leave Act. It could be called the working family protection act. Under this law, if you get sick, if your child gets sick, or your parent needs medical care, you can take time away from work without losing your job. Sometimes this time off can be the most important time in a family's life. It can also be the toughest time. But it would be a lot tougher if the family couldn't face it together.

If you know a family who's needed to use this leave, you know why it's so important. I know some of these families, and three of them are here today. Kenny Weaver, a Texas petroleum worker, took guaranteed leave to be with his daughter, Melissa. Diane Atwood

of Little Rock, Arkansas, needed leave to fight her own battle with Hodgkin's disease. J.C. Shardo of Atlanta needed to take a leave when her brother Swartz needed her by his side when he became ill. Because of this law, families in crisis can be together, and the breadwinners need not fear they'll lose their jobs.

The family and medical leave law is good for our families and it's good for our businesses because it allows our people to be both good parents or good children or good siblings and good workers. It supports family stability and family responsibility.

I want to make sure that if you're eligible for guaranteed leave, you know about it. As many as 50 million Americans are eligible, and as many as 3 million people a year may need to use it. If you work in the public sector or in the private sector for an employer who employs 50 or more people, you qualify to apply for a leave of 12 weeks for family or medical reasons.

The U.S. Labor Department has backed the claims of thousands of workers who were denied leave or fired when they tried to use this law. That's illegal. We'll protect your rights and the rights of your family. This law shows that we, as a nation, can value families through the choices we make together.

We've got a lot of other family choices to make in the weeks and months ahead. This week the Senate finally will take up welfare reform, which is also all about helping people become good workers and good parents. We've reached agreement on requiring teen mothers to live at home and stay in school, requiring parents to pay the child support they owe or work off what they owe. Now we need a bipartisan agreement that requires people on welfare to work but makes sure they get the child care they need to stay off welfare for good and to be good parents.

Family values are a big part of our national budget. Two years ago, our national budget reduced the deficit; that's good family values.

But we increased the number of children in Head Start, we provided for immunizing all our children under 2, we made college loans more affordable and easier to repay, we increased tax relief for working parents, and we increased job training. We need to build on that family agenda, not tear it down.

The congressional majority seems to be determined to cut back on programs that advance our family values. How can you talk about family values in one breath, and in the next, take Head Start away from 50,000 poor children or cut back college loans and grants for students who need and deserve them or cut back worker training for people who are unemployed? But all that happened in the House of Representatives this week. They call it change. I say it shortchanges America's families in the fight for the future. This vote is antifamily, and I won't let it stand.

It's not too late to build a legacy—to build on the legacy of family leave. We ought to invest in education, invest in our families, raise the minimum wage, target tax relief to raising children and educating them, protect the Medicare of our seniors, and protect the right of people to keep their health insurance if they change jobs or if someone in the family gets sick. These are the kind of things that are worthy of the legacy of family leave. We have to work hard so that we know that our families will be better off, so that we can make tomorrow better than today for every family.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Children's Inn at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD.

Proclamation 6814—National Child Support Awareness Month, 1995

August 5, 1995

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Providing for our children is one of humanity's worthiest and most fundamental endeavors. Children are the best part of ourselves—the sum of our past and the promise of our future, the guarantee that our lives

and values and dreams will flourish long after we are gone. Sadly, however, many parents in our country today deny the instinct to care for their children, failing to provide even the most basic economic support. Millions of America's children have no legally identified father. Millions do not receive the financial support they need to lead secure and healthy lives.

Because of these harsh realities, I have made the reform of our Nation's child support system one of the top priorities of my Administration. The welfare reform plan that I proposed to the Congress last year contains the toughest child support enforcement measures in America's history—measures that would improve the effectiveness of procedures for establishing paternity, make it easier to enter and update child support awards, and dramatically strengthen our ability to enforce payment of those awards. My proposals would also give us the ability to track deadbeat parents across State lines, suspend their driver's licenses if necessary, and make them work off what they owe.

As the Nation's largest single employer, the Federal Government must take a leadership role in the effort to ensure that all of America's children are properly supported. In February of this year, I signed an Executive order requiring Federal agencies to cooperate fully with measures to establish and enforce child support orders and to inform employees of how they can meet their support obligations. Additionally, we are encouraging State and local governments to develop innovative approaches to helping families cope with child support issues, and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has begun to restructure and strengthen its partnerships with State child support agencies.

This month we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Child Support Enforcement Program at HHS. This program—at the Federal, State, and local levels—has been instrumental in giving hope and support to America's children while fostering strong families and responsible parenting. Through their efforts, over 5.1 million children now have a legally recognized father; more than 11.7 million children with a parent living outside of their homes have a legal right to the financial sup-

port of that parent; and over \$72.5 billion has been provided for children by their non-custodial parents.

But for all that we have accomplished, we still have much to do. By ensuring the enactment and implementation of my Administration's strong child support enforcement proposals, we will send a clear signal to our citizens that they should not have children until they are prepared to care for them. Those who do bring children into the world must bear the responsibility of supporting them. We must rededicate ourselves to the task of putting these youngest and most vulnerable of our citizens first.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim August 1995, as "National Child Support Awareness Month." I call upon the citizens of the United States to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of August, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:09 p.m., August 7, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 8.

Interview with Bob Edwards and Mara Liasson of National Public Radio

August 7, 1995

Bosnia and Croatia

Mr. Edwards. Well, Croatia is back into it, and we wonder how the Croat offensive affects the prospects of a U.N. withdrawal and the accompanying commitment of U.S. ground troops.

The President. Well, my guess is that if the Croat offensive concludes successfully in the Krajina area, as it appears to be doing, and that is the extent of it, that it will not

increase the chances of the U.N. withdrawing. But it does change the kind of balance of play in the area. And when you put that with the new resolve of NATO and the willingness of the U.N. to let NATO use air power and the establishment of the Rapid Reaction Force, two things we worked very hard for in the last few weeks, it may create some new opportunities to work toward a resolution of this.

Now, we're concerned, and we've told the Croats we're concerned about anything that would spread the war, that would widen the war. But if the offensive concludes with the reestablishment of the dominance, the Croatia in the Krajina area, then I think it will not increase the chances of U.N. withdrawal.

Mr. Edwards. In the absence of direct U.S. involvement, why should the American people care about this conflict?

The President. The American people should care, first of all, because if the war spreads in the Balkans to other areas it could destabilize many, many countries in which we have a vital interest and bring America into the fray. Secondly, we should care because an awful lot of human damage has been done there, and a lot of people's human rights have been violated, and we should try to minimize the loss of life and human suffering. Thirdly, we should care because it's the first real security crisis in Europe after the end of the cold war, and it is important that we, working with our European allies through the United Nations and through NATO, do as much as humanly possible to do, given the fact that when you have these kind of intra-ethnic conflicts within countries, to some extent, any outside power is going to be limited in stopping the killing until there is a greater willingness to make peace. But we have to do our best to try to minimize the carnage, to try to keep it from spreading, and to try to demonstrate a consistent and determined and long-lasting commitment by our allies through the United Nations and through NATO to resolve this.

Ms. Liasson. Mr. President, there are tens of thousands of Krajina Serbs now who are being ethnically cleaned, and they're fleeing over the border into Bosnia. Can you tell us how that influx of Serbs into Bosnia will af-

fect the conflict there? And also, what can you tell us about Croatian President Franjo Tudjman's intentions? Does he want to maintain the Bosnia Croat Federation, or do you think he wants an ethnically pure state of his own?

The President. Well, first, let's remember what gave rise to this offensive. There was a Bosnian Serb attack supported by the Krajina Serbs on the Bihac area of Bosnia, which is a Muslim area or at least a government area now. And President Tudjman ordered a counterattack to try to relieve Bihac, and in the process, to try to secure the areas within Croatia under control of his government.

I believe that he wants to see the Croats and the Muslims stay in their confederation within Bosnia. And you know, the United States took the lead in brokering that confederation. I think that it's very important because it ended, in effect, one-half of the civil war within Bosnia; so I felt good about that. And I think it will endure. I believe that confederation will endure.

What impact the Krajina Serbs going over into Bosnian territory will have is, frankly, impossible to determine at this time. If they become members of the Bosnian Serb army, then it could have a destabilizing impact. But no one knows for sure. That's why I say that circumstances have changed there in a way that might give us the opportunity to make some new efforts at a diplomatic settlement, and I'm going to be talking with our allies over the next few days to discuss that.

Ms. Liasson. But before the Croat offensive started you warned the Croats not to target civilians and not to target U.N. peacekeepers. They seem to have ignored both of those warnings. Do you have any control over the Croats?

The President. No, but I think we have—I think we and the Germans have some influence with the Croats. And I think what appears to have happened is they had more success than they had, I think, perhaps even imagined they might in the battle. And so they kept going until they had recovered that portion of their territory which had been previously under the dominance of the Krajina Serbs.

I do believe that President Tudjman will be reluctant to do anything that will knowingly spread the war and totally destabilize the situation in ways that undermine his interest and the interest of the Bosnian Croat Confederation within Bosnia. So, as I said, I'm hopeful that this will turn out to be something that will give us an avenue to a quicker diplomatic resolution, not a road to a longer war.

Mr. Edwards. This is the most important foreign policy problem of your Presidency, and you are seen as indecisive. Senator Dole has tried to take advantage of that. Is this frustrating to you in a situation such as Bosnia, where no action might actually be the best action?

The President. Well, first of all, I disagree that it's the most important foreign policy problem. It's the foreign policy problem that's the longest lasting and, therefore, the most publicized. But the most important things we have done, I think, you'd have to start out with our continued efforts with Russia and the other republics of the former Soviet Union to denuclearize, our efforts to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which have been very successful and which the United States has led, our efforts at peace in the Middle East. All those things, it seems to me, over the long run, in terms of America's vital interest, are more important.

The Bosnian situation is heartbreaking. And it is potentially very important to our security interests should it spread, which is why I have sent troops to the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia to try to make sure that it doesn't spread. But is it frustrating? Sure it is, because most of the people who criticize don't have a better alternative. And many of them who criticize don't have any alternative.

The United States, before I became President, made a decision not to send troops in the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. Frankly, at the time, it's my understanding that our European allies agreed with that. They wanted to take the lead in dealing with this big security problem, the first one of the post-cold-war era. The U.N., in any case, was not supposed to be trying to determine the outcome of the war but simply trying to mini-

mize the violence and get the humanitarian aid through.

Now we have spent as much or more money as any country in supporting the peace process in Bosnia, in supporting the humanitarian aid and the airlift, and trying to keep the war out of the air, and doing all the things that we have done from our ships and from our bases, to fly literally tens of thousands of flights. We have also been responsible for taking the lead in establishing the alliance between the Bosnian Government and the Croatians. We took the lead in asserting the need for NATO to use its air power. In 1994, we had a pretty good year there because of this aggressive action on our part. And it fell apart when the United Nations decided not to let NATO use its power whenever a U.N. soldier had been taken hostage.

Now we have changed the ground rules on the ground with the Rapid Reaction Force, and we've got a new set of command and control rules for NATO. So we seem to be making some progress. There have been several convoys go in and out of Gorazde, for example, without being attacked.

I believe we have done all we could to work with our allies, and I think we have exercised all the influence we could, considering the fact that they have soldiers on the ground and we don't. And I do not believe that under these circumstances we should have put ground troops on the ground in the U.N. mission. So I think history will reflect that, given the options, none of which were very pleasant in a very difficult situation, that we have done the right things and that they were better than the alternatives available to us.

Ms. Liasson. Mr. President, recently you said the reason why the United States and NATO and the U.N. have all lost prestige in Bosnia is because they went around saying they were going to do something and then they didn't do it. In retrospect, would it have been better not to have said that you were going to lift the arms embargo and then help the Muslims with air strikes? Do you think you raised expectations there that couldn't be met?

The President. No because when I ran for President I made it clear that I would

support a lifting of the arms embargo multilaterally. I never said I would lift it unilaterally. I was, frankly, surprised, given the record we had of Serbian aggression when I became President, that our allies would not agree to lift the arms embargo multilaterally. But they felt it would put their own troops too much at risk, and they believed that it would not do what I thought, which was to induce the Bosnian Serbs to make a quick peace.

Let me say that air strikes cannot win a war, but they can raise the price of aggression. And if you believe as I do, that territorial disputes between the sides now could be resolved without the legitimate interests of any ethnic group being eroded, I think that's a very important reason for using air strikes to increase the price of aggression.

But it didn't happen in '93, so in '94, we got a different kind of agreement to use air power—our own air power—in return for not lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government. And it worked. The Serbs and the Bosnian Government brought their heavy weapons into collection points. The cafe areas were largely free from shelling and military activity. And the whole thing only came apart when, number one, no peace was reached in 1994, and number two, when military activity started in the central part of the country spread to these safe areas and the U.N. would not permit NATO to strike back.

So that's what I would say. If you say for sure you're going to do something, you simply have to do it. And if you don't do it, you suffer. And that's what happened to the U.N. and the NATO. And because the United States is a part of those organizations and has a leading role in NATO, it hurt us as well. And that's why I told our allies I would try one more time to have NATO play a role in this, one more time to try to support them with their Rapid Reaction Force. But the United States could not be part of any endeavor that made commitments which were not kept. We have to keep commitments once we make them.

Ms. Liasson. You've talked, though, about the limits of the U.S. being able to dictate the outcome of something when we don't have troops on the ground. Does that mean

that the U.S. can only lead if it's willing to commit troops in situations like this?

The President. As I said, we have exercised a leadership role in pushing the air power and leading the humanitarian air lift and putting our troops on the border and in getting the Croatians and the Bosnian Muslims to agree to a confederation. So in that sense, we have. But our ability to exercise a leadership role when the British, the French, the Dutch, and the others who have troops on the ground believe that what we want to do will endanger their troops but not ours, since we're not there, is necessarily limited. But that is, after all, part of what we, I think, should be working toward in the post-cold-war world.

The United States, obviously, will have to make a decision whether we think we should run every show and totally dominate every crisis. But if we want to do that, we do have to be willing to have troops on the ground where others have troops on the ground. I believe that we have exercised a great deal of leadership, and I think it's been consistent with our interest in not having troops there in this U.N. mission. I could not have countenanced putting American troops in the position where they could be fired upon and taken as hostages without firing back. I don't believe in that. I don't think that's what the United States is all about. And I do not believe the United States should be there trying to win this war on the ground, as a combatant. I don't believe in that. So I have said that I would not send troops there unless it's necessary to take our allies out.

Teenage Smoking

Mr. Edwards. You're wrestling with a difficult decision on tobacco. Why not let the FDA regulate tobacco? Polls show a lot of support for regulating smoking among teenagers.

The President. Well, I don't know that it's such a difficult decision. We're working through what our options are, and I've talked with Dr. Kessler at the FDA. He has asked me to do that, and we've been involved with him and discussed that.

But this country has to do something about the problem of teenage smoking. It's going back up. We know that a significant percent-

age of young people who start to smoke will smoke consistently throughout their lives, and that if they do, a significant percentage of them will die from diseases directly related to their smoking. We know that if we wanted to lower the cost of health care and increase the life expectancy of our people and improve the health of the American people, there's almost nothing you could do that would have a bigger impact than dramatically reducing the number of young people who stop smoking or who never start smoking. So we have to have a vigorous response to that, and I expect to have an announcement on that in the next several days—not too far away.

Ms. Liasson. Is it possible to regulate tobacco as a drug and not spark years of litigation?

The President. Well, that's one of the things that bothers me. You know, I think we need a tough and mandatory type program, but I don't want to see us in a position where we act like we're going to do something, but we wind up in years and years and years of costly litigation while kids continue to be bombarded with advertisements, plainly designed to get them to smoke, with all kinds of promotional activities while they can still buy cigarettes in vending machines, while there's no real comprehensive national law against their buying cigarettes. And meanwhile, these lawsuits drag on.

So I'm concerned about that. And that's one of the reasons I think that Dr. Kessler and the FDA have wanted to have a series of conversations with the White House because everybody involved in this, at least from our point of view, wants to focus on the whole problem of children smoking and how to stop it and to stop it from starting.

Mr. Edwards. You say mandatory, you're not going to have any kind of voluntary program for the industry?

The President. Well, I believe we have to have some means of knowing that whatever we all agree to, whatever people say they're going to do is done. And I think we need some strength there. So we'll just—I'm looking at what my options are, and I expect to have an announcement in the near future. You won't be waiting long to know how we're going to resolve this. But there will be a

strong commitment here to doing something about children smoking.

Ms. Liasson. Are you saying the tobacco industry can't be trusted to comply with some kind of a voluntary deal?

The President. I've already talked a lot about this. I'll have more to say in the next few days.

The Middle Class

Mr. Edwards. You've spoken a lot about the squeeze on the American middle class, although the economy is good, incomes are not keeping up, people are working harder for less, and they've been anxious about their futures. Without control of Congress, what can you do to relieve some of that anxiety?

The President. Well, one thing that I can do is to keep trying to grow the economy and to keep following policies that will lead to balanced and fair growth. That's what we were trying to do with the Japanese trade action, for example. I have been responsible for a greater expansion of trade than any other administration, I think, than any other President, with NAFTA and GATT and 80 separate trade agreements. But I also want fair trade. I want trade that will strengthen the jobs and the incomes of America's workers, which is why I took the action I did with Japan with regard to auto parts and autos.

We also can make sure that the laws we have on the books are enforced in a way that tend to support good jobs and good wages. That's why I don't favor, for example, a repeal of the Davis-Bacon law or some other laws that are on the Government's books which at least say when we're doing business we want to try to support a high-wage, high-opportunity society.

But there are things that I think this Congress can do and some other things I think they shouldn't do. And I'll just—let me just give you three examples very quickly. Two things I think they should do. I think they ought to raise the minimum wage. The minimum wage has had bipartisan support in the past, and I think has broad bipartisan support among the American people. If this Congress does not raise the minimum wage, as I have asked it to do, we'll have the lowest minimum wage we've had in 40 years in terms of real purchasing power next year. That's not my

idea of the kind of country I'm trying to create for the 21st century. I don't want a hard-work, low-wage America. I want a high-opportunity, high-growth America.

The second thing they could do is to pass the bill I have proposed which has bipartisan support to create a "GI bill for America's workers." And our proposal is to take the 70 or so separate training programs the Government has now, collapse them, put them in a big pot of cash, and give workers who are unemployed or who are underemployed a voucher which they can take to their local community college worth \$2,500 or so a year for up to 2 years to get the training and education they need. This would go around the Federal Government, the State government, and the local government. This is just something we could give to unemployed Americans, people that lose their jobs and need to acquire new skills. Almost every American now is within driving distance of a community college or other fine training institute. They'd make the decisions, and all they'd have to do is prove they spent the money at the appropriate place. They could pass that.

The third thing that Congress should do is to do no harm—do no harm. They are on a path now which will dramatically increase the middle class squeeze. By cutting all this education money, they are cutting off the future for millions of Americans. By cutting all the Medicare and Medicaid money, what they are doing is to make sure that more and more middle class people who are middle-aged will have to spend much higher percentages of their incomes supporting their elderly parents, and, therefore, will have less to spend on themselves and in educating their own children.

And none of that is necessary to balance the budget. I have given them an alternative. So they should raise the minimum wage, pass the "GI bill for America's workers," and do not harm on education and health care. Those things will help us.

But, you know, we've never had a period like this before, really, where we've got 7 million new jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 1½ million new businesses, the largest number in American history in this period of time, very high stock market—about 4,700—

rapid growth of corporate profits, and stagnant wages for half the American workers. We've got to turn that around. And these things will help.

1996 Election

Ms. Liasson. Mr. President, you did a pretty good job in 1992 figuring out what the election was going to be about, what was on people's minds. What do you think the election of 1996 is going to be about? What are the three or four top issues that you think Americans care most about right now?

The President. Well, in 1996, I think the election will be—there will be economic issues still at the forefront, more in terms of family security. That is, I think that people will see the economy as a two-step process, not a one-step process. And I hope maybe I can communicate that more clearly. That is, what we started doing—reducing the deficit, expanding trade, increasing investment in technology, promoting defense conversion, all those things—they produce a lot of jobs, but now we have to raise incomes and a sense of family security. So I think there will be a whole cluster of family security issues that are economic and that deal with the whole issue of opportunity.

Then I believe there will be some significant debates about social issues and what kind of responsibilities we have individually and to each other in this society. If we don't get welfare reform legislation through, that will be an issue. If there's a continuing effort to undermine law enforcement as there has been now in the Congress—the leaders of Congress told me, for example, after Oklahoma City they would have the antiterrorism bill on my desk by Memorial Day; that's late May. Here we are almost to mid-August and no sign of the bill. I think that will be an issue because Americans are still concerned about their security.

And then the third set of issues will be about—so the opportunity issues, responsibility issues, and then I think there will be a set of issues that have to do with how we're going to move together into the 21st century. How are we going to handle our diversity. What's the responsible way to handle our immigration problems which are considerable.

So those are the kinds of things that I think will dominate this election. It's basically, this is one more jumping off stage, the last one we'll have before the next century. And I hope that it will be dominated by two competing visions of what America will look like in the next century and how we will live and how we will work together.

Mr. Edwards. But the strongest sentiment we're hearing from voters seem to reject both visions. They seem to be looking for a third party, a third force to put their faith in. What is that—

The President. I don't know that they reject both visions. I think they consistently accept my vision when they hear it. It's almost impossible for people to know what's going on out there given the nature of communications today. There's a lot of information, but it's always on something new day-in and day-out. And it tends to emphasize conflict over achievement. And so I think what we need is an election to see that.

And also, a lot of people are kind of frustrated with their own lives and don't see the connection between governmental action on the one hand and improvements in their circumstances on the other. All of this is to be expected in a time of transition and difficulty. But I basically think the prognosis for America's future is quite bright. And if somebody wants to run as a third party candidate they ought to, but that's like—that's "the buyer's remorse" and "the grass is always greener on the other side," and all of that. You know, you hear all of that.

But I believe that the '96 election will really give me an opportunity I have not had since I've been here to get out and talk about what we've done that we promised to do, what difference it's made for America, and what still needs to be done. I think the third category should be the most important thing, what are we going to do tomorrow. But I'm not at all pessimistic about where America is or where this administration is. We've done a lot of things that were very important. We've kept up very high percentages of our commitments. We've had a great deal of success with the efforts that we've made, and I look forward to having a chance to discuss that. But meanwhile, I'm going to try to delay

the onset of the political season as long as possible and just keep doing my job.

Mr. Edwards. But how can you say that the American people share your vision? A majority did not elect you and then came the '94 election that——

The President. Yes but that doesn't mean—the American people didn't ratify the Contract on America. What they ratified—there were two things. A lot of the people who voted in '92 were disillusioned and didn't vote because they'd been fed a steady diet of bad news and because their own circumstances hadn't improved. And we said this many new jobs came into the economy and the deficit was reduced by 50 percent for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. Huge numbers of voters said, "I just don't believe it; I just don't believe it," because their lives weren't better, and they didn't hear about it in their regular communications. They were anxiety ridden; they were frustrated; they were angry. The Republicans said, "Vote for us, we've got a plan, and the first item is balancing the budget." All the research after the election showed that that's what people knew.

Now, there are two plans to balance the budget. I believe two-thirds of the American people agree with my way. I think they'd rather take a little longer, have a smaller tax cut and protect the incomes of elderly Americans on Medicare, protect our investments in education from Head Start to affordable college loans and not gut the environment. That's what I believe. I believe the American people want a high-wage, high-growth, high-opportunity future, with safe streets and a clean environment where people have a chance to make the most of their own lives. I believe that's what they really want. And I think they believe we ought to work together toward that.

And my referendum will come in '96, and we'll just see. But there's a lot—if you look at the research, I think there is a lot of common ground in America. I believe the American people, left to their own devices, would come to commonsense, progressive conclusions on a lot of these issues. And I think the political system basically seeks to divide them in little slices and wedges to advance

the causes of whoever's doing the dividing. But that's not really what the American people want, which is why they often say, "I'd like third way," because they're sick of partisan bickering in Washington and people who are trying to advance their short-term interest at the expense of the long-term public interest in this country.

Federal Budget

Ms. Liasson. I wanted to ask you about some partisan bickering that's coming up pretty soon, which is the big battle over the budget in the fall. Now, you've said you didn't want to pile up a stack of vetoes, you've threatened quite a few of them. But Republicans say they don't believe that you're going to make good on all these threats, especially if it means that agencies will close or if the Government can't borrow the money to send out benefit checks. Are you willing to see the Government shut down if that's what it takes to protect your priorities?

The President. Well, first of all, let's look at what they're threatening to do. And the American people need to know it as unprecedented. They are responsible. If the Government gets shut down, it will be their responsibility. They will have to vote or not vote to lift the debt ceiling. They will have to vote or not vote for continuing resolutions to let this Government go on. I will have no role in that; that is their responsibility.

My responsibility was fulfilled when I offered them an alternative balanced budget and a willingness to discuss it. So far, none of them have been willing to discuss anything. They have not been willing to discuss this. They seem determined—for example, they seemed absolutely determined to raise the cost of Medicare in copayments, in premiums and deductibles to seniors with incomes of \$25,000 a year or less. They seem determined to raise the cost of going to college. They seem determined to cut kids off Head Start. They seem determined to gut the environmental laws of this country when none of that is necessary to balance the budget, and they haven't even discussed it with me.

So what I'm going to do is—and these veto threats that I've been issuing, they're really sort of veto notices. I'm just trying to be as

forthright and honest and forthcoming as I can with people who so far have not expressed any interest in having any dialog with me. It's a funny way to do business. But if you ask me am I going to blink at the end and basically to avoid shutting down the Government, risk shutting down America 10 or 15 years from now because of the costs we're taking, the answer to that is, no, I am not going to blink at the end. As awful as it is, it would be better to shut the Government down for a few days than to shut the country down a few years from now because we took a radical and unwarranted road here that the American people never voted for, don't believe in.

So I think it's easy to over-read the results of the '94 election. I think you could convincingly argue that the NRA put the House of Representatives in Republican hands if you look at the number of short races, close races that were turned there. But the other voters that were voting for the Republicans and the other voters that were staying home weren't ratifying a repeal on the assault weapons ban or a repeal of the Brady bill.

So I don't think you can make these kind of connections. I'm just going to stand up and fight for what I believe in but be willing to work with them. But if they don't ever want to work with me and they keep trying to push this country off the brink, I cannot in good conscience let America gut its commitment to education from Head Start for poor children to affordable college loans for college students, when I know that that is the key to our economic future. And I know it's the only way to expand middle class incomes over the long run. I cannot in good conscience let a budget go through which essentially undermines our ability to provide for clean air, clean water, and pure food when I know good and well the American people never voted for that in 1994.

And I certainly have no intention of destroying Medicare under the guise of saving it when I know we can fix the Medicare Trust Fund, which does not have anything to do—the Medicare Trust Fund that the Republicans are always talking about is in some trouble, less trouble than when I took office. I pushed the insolvency date out 2 or 3 years already, and I know we can fix that and never

touch the premiums, the copays, and the deductibles. And they know it, too. They know this has nothing to do with fixing the Medicare Trust Fund.

So we ought to get together like civilized human beings and good Americans and do what's best for the American people. The one time I thought we were going to do it was when I had the meeting with the Speaker up in New Hampshire and that fellow asked us a nice question, and we shook hands on it. We said, yes, we'd appoint a commission like a base closing commission to look into political reform. And 5 days after I got back I sent a letter to the Speaker suggesting that we ought to appoint this commission in the same way the base closing commission was appointed. Five weeks later I still hadn't gotten an answer to my letter. I still haven't gotten an answer to my letter. It's been 7 or 8 weeks now. So I appointed two distinguished Americans, John Gardner and Doris Kearns Goodwin, to go try to work this out. They haven't seen the Speaker either.

So this is a different world up here. The American people don't understand this. I think most Americans are still conservative and old-fashioned in the best sense. They think when you shake hands, especially when you do it in broad daylight in front of the whole country, you ought to do what you say you're going to do. And I intend to do it. That's just the way I am. It's the way I was brought up. I don't understand this. I don't understand people that don't talk to one another and don't try to see one another's point of view and that don't try to reach common accord. So that door over there is going to stay open all the way, but I will not be—I will not be blackmailed into selling the American people's future down the drain to avoid a train wreck. Better a train wreck for a day or 3 or 4, better political damage to Bill Clinton than damaging the future of millions and millions and millions of Americans. I'm just not going to do it.

Mr. Edwards. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

China

Ms. Liasson. Mr. President, just one quick yes or no question. Should Mrs. Clinton go to China if Harry Wu is still held?

The President. Well, no decision has yet been made on that, and we're just going to follow events as they develop and try to make a good decision. It's an important conference. The United States will be represented, but no decision has been made yet about whether she will go.

NOTE: The interview began at 1:48 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House, and it was recorded for broadcast on August 9.

Proclamation 6815—Minority Enterprise Development Week, 1995
August 7, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

For citizens throughout the Nation, entrepreneurship is a proven gateway to economic empowerment. At its best, our free enterprise system works to ensure that all of our citizens have the opportunity to contribute fully to America's economic growth and to benefit fully from our economy's success. However, the road to entrepreneurial achievement is seldom easy. Those who undertake the journey must be talented, determined, and brave. But America has a history of rewarding risk-takers, and there is much to be gained in the attempt.

If this country is to continue to prosper in the years ahead, we must hold fast to the promise of minority enterprise development. Business growth in our minority communities creates wealth, encourages self-sufficiency, and generates jobs where they are needed. My Administration is working hard to strengthen all of our Nation's businesses, opening new domestic and international markets, stimulating the efficient use of developed but underutilized land in older cities and towns, and reducing the cost of borrowing for business start-ups and expansions. These innovative efforts are making an impact, and people throughout America are stepping forward to take advantage of the possibilities of investment.

This week plays an important part in our work to promote the growth of the minority business community. As we recognize Ameri-

ca's outstanding minority business men and women, we honor their accomplishments and help spur them on to greater heights. Highlighting their success, this occasion touches even those who have not yet dreamed of starting their own businesses. We are all inspired by the example our entrepreneurs have set.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim September 24 through September 30, 1995, as "Minority Enterprise Development Week." I call on all Americans to commemorate this event with appropriate ceremonies and activities, joining together to recognize the contributions that minority entrepreneurs make every day to our national economic security.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of August, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twentieth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:10 a.m., August 8, 1995]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 9.

Remarks on Environmental Protection in Baltimore, Maryland
August 8, 1995

Thank you very much. As you can tell, the Vice President really has no strong convictions about this issue. [Laughter] That's the darnedest stump speech I've heard in a long time. I thought for a minute he was a write-in candidate for mayor here. [Laughter] It was a great speech, and thank you for what you said.

Thank you, Doris McGuigan, and thank you to all of your allies here for reminding us what's really behind all these issues. One of the biggest problems we have in Washington, even though it's very close to Baltimore—one of the biggest problems we have is having people there remember that the de-

cisions they make there affect how you live here and then making sure that people who live here understand the impact of the decisions that are made there. You have helped us, every one of you—Doris, for what you've done and all of you, for coming out here today—you have helped us to reestablish that critical link between the American people and their Government, so you can decide what you're for and what you're against and how it's going to affect your children and your future. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, for coming. Thank you, Congressman Gilchrest, for your outstanding support of the environment. And I want to thank all of my friends who are State officials and city officials. And Senator Miller, thank you for coming. And I want to say a special word of appreciation, too, to the first person who spoke, our EPA Administrator, Carol Browner, who has done a magnificent job in her work.

I want to deliver a pretty simple message today. Every office I have ever held of the public trust, from being attorney general of my State to being Governor to being President, required me to swear an oath to protect the people I was elected to serve, to give people the security they need to live up to the most of their God-given potential. Central to that security is the right to know that the air we breathe and the food we eat and the water we drink will be safe and the right to know if there's any risk to those things.

This basic security really is in jeopardy today. There are people who want to strip away decades of public health protection. I intend to fight them every step of the way. As I said, the battle over environmental protection is being fought in Washington, but here in communities like this one all across America, big and small, you see what is really at stake. Most hard-working families have enough on their minds without having to worry about an environmental hazard in their neighborhood.

Most people have enough trouble just trying to educate their kids and pay their bills and keep body and soul together and deal with all the changes in the global economy and how they bear down on community after community and business after business and

job after job. Most people have enough to deal with without having to worry about their food, their air, and their water. But at least they have a right to know what is in it and whether something else is about to be put in it. That's what this Community Right-to-Know Act was all about. You heard the Vice President say it was passed almost a decade ago now, signed by President Reagan, strengthened by President Bush, strongly supported by this administration.

This is an issue that's very personal with me. I've dealt with the whole issue of right-to-know around chemicals for nearly 20 years now, since I was a young attorney general and a train loaded with chemicals in car after car blew up in a small southern town in the southern part of my State where a relative of mine was the sheriff. And it was just a God's miracle that we didn't have hundreds and hundreds of people killed in this little town. And the first thing that occurred to everybody is: Who knew what about what was on the train? Who knew what about how safely it was being carried? Who knew what about what kind of precaution should have been taken when the train pulled into the station?

That was almost 20 years ago. And I have seen this issue catch on now like wildfire as people in American communities all across our country have demanded the right to have some basic control over their own lives and their futures. The right-to-know law now requires manufacturers to tell the public how much they pollute. And if you want to know what's coming out of the smokestacks across the water, for example, all you have to do now is call your local library or the EPA and the information is there for you.

The Community Right-to-Know Act does not tell companies what they can and can't produce. It doesn't require massive bureaucracy. It doesn't affect every company, just those in certain industries. It's carefully focused on a list of 650 specific dangerous toxins. About 300 of those have been added since this administration came into office, I might add. And over 100 of them are known to cause cancer. This law works, as you have heard.

You have had particular success here because you've had such a good grassroots com-

munity effort with your 74 percent reduction. But you need to know that nationwide, every place in the country since the Community Right-to-Know Act has been on the books reported reductions in toxic emissions, or about 43 percent for the whole country. Now, that is a law worth passing—no new bureaucracy, just power to the people through basic knowledge.

This has kept millions of pounds of chemicals out of our lives. It's helped people to stay healthy and live longer. And as you have already heard, it's also helped to spur innovation to help businesses work smarter and cleaner and become more profitable, not less profitable.

Our environmental progress, from the community right-to-know law to the Clean Air Act to so many others, has been the source of bipartisan pride, as has been mentioned. Therefore, it has been something of a surprise to many of us—and I think some in the Republican Party as well as most of us in the Democratic Party—to see what is happening in the Congress now, to see this dramatic departure from the bipartisan efforts of the last 25 years.

The House voted to gut environmental and public health protections last week under the pressure of lobbyists for those who have a vested financial interest in seeing that happen. The budget bill they passed would cut environmental enforcement by 50 percent. It would virtually bring to a halt the Federal enforcement of the Clean Water Act and toxic waste cleanups—a terrible mistake, a terrible mistake.

In a brazen display of the power of these special interest groups, the House added 18 separate loopholes, giveaways, and stop-in-your-tracks orders, stripping away very specific public safeguards to benefit very specific interest groups. One provision allows oil refineries to spew benzene, a cancer-causing chemical, without stringent safeguards. Another would allow factories to dump 15 million pounds of toxic chemicals into our Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams next year alone—one year. Another permits cement kilns and other incinerators to burn cancer-causing chemicals without effective control. The House majority also voted to gut com-

munity right-to-know, literally rolling back protections that are already on the books.

And if you ask them why they did this, they say, "Oh, well, we regret it, but there are all these crazy Federal regulators that are bringing to a halt the American economy." The problem is, there is no evidence that environmental protection has hurt our economy at all—none. And furthermore, this administration and this EPA Administrator have done more than anybody in 25 years to try to streamline regulation, reduce the burden of excessive regulation, get rid of dumb rules that don't make sense. Carol Browner has committed to reduce by 25 percent the amount of time businesses have to spend filling out forms, but not to destroy the standards, the rules, the regulation, and the community empowerment that are keeping our environment clean. And I am telling you, we can fix bureaucratic problems, but we cannot fix—we cannot fix—the environmental damage that would be done if they tore up the progress of the last 25 years.

If the environmental laws have been so terrible for this country, you tell me how our economy has produced 7 million jobs in the last 2½ years, 1½ million new businesses, 2½ million new homeowners. Why is the stock market at 4,700 if the environment is so bad? We've got some problems. We have stagnant middle class incomes. We've got to get more money for people who are out there doing America's work. But the economy is doing well, and the people who own these businesses are doing well. And our country is moving forward in every single measure except raising middle class incomes. That is the problem. But the environment is not causing that, and there is no evidence for this. This is a big mistake. It is a terrible mistake. And I will not let our country make it. There is no evidence to support it.

I think all of you know, and I have already said, that the minute these anti-environmental measures hit my desk they will be dead. But I intend to do more than that. I want to use the authority of my office to ensure the right of parents to know what chemicals their children are being exposed to. I want more communities to be able to proudly introduce people like Doris and say we've reduced our chemical emissions by 74 per-

cent. That's what I want. I want to see more people doing their own work for their own people and their own future. So just before I left for Baltimore, I signed an Executive order which says any manufacturer who wants to do business with the Federal Government must tell its neighbors what dangerous chemicals it puts into the air, the earth, and the water. No disclosure; no contract. [Applause] Thank you. And I am directing our agencies to take the next steps to act quickly and openly to continue to strengthen community right-to-know; if appropriate, to extend it to more industries and thousands more communities; to require companies to disclose more complete information.

Let me say this: There is an orderly process for this now. It is an orderly, open, fair process where we say what we're thinking about doing through the EPA. Then all the interests affected—people like you all across America and the industries, too, and the businesses—they get to come in and say what they feel. And if there are mistakes or if the Government is going too far, if everybody admits something doesn't need to be done, it can all be changed. That is the orderly way this should be done. And that is precisely what Congress—at least some in Congress—are trying to stop us from doing, this orderly, neighborly, open, honest process in which we arrive at these kind of standards.

I want to continue to strengthen the right to know through that kind of open and fair process. But I want you to know something else. If Congress passes a law to block this kind of process in future right-to-know issues, then I will issue another Executive order to finish that job as well.

The message here is clear. Congress can go right on with its plan to undermine America's antipollution laws, but it will go nowhere fast. Community right-to-know is here to stay. I want more neighborhoods like this one all across America. And I want America to see you tonight on the evening news and hear about you tomorrow in the newspapers and on the radio stations so people know what they can do if they work together with the law.

Let me just say there is more here than a single law at stake. Democracies always

have depended upon the free flow of information to ordinary citizens. Our democracy in this age, which has been heralded the information age, is being regaled constantly with the dreams of all the television channels we're going to be able to get, all the different radio stations, all the different magazines we can read. We are going to be awash in information. Wouldn't it be tragic if, in the information age, the single most significant thing to come out of this Congress was blocking information that you need to know about the most basic health and safety requirements of your families, your children, and your community? That's not my idea of the 21st century information society. I want you to know more, not less. And I think you do, too.

And if you need any evidence of that, just look what happened when the former Soviet Union and the whole Communist empire in Eastern Europe broke up. We saw some of the awfulest environmental problems anywhere in the world because there was development there without democracy, because today's economics took the place of the health and safety of their people and, in the end, helped to undermine their economy. If we needed any other evidence, that alone ought to be enough.

So I just want to close by asking you when you walk away from here to think about what your ordinary day is like. Think about the information that keeps you and your family safe and healthy. Think about what your child might see that might change his or her behavior: a stop sign, a label that tells you what's in the food you buy for your family, the warning on a pack of cigarettes. This and other things are simple things that we take for granted because their cost is minimal. But their value is priceless. The silent threat posed by pollution is as real and dangerous as the threat of a speeding car to a walking child. We've known for a long time that what we can't see can hurt us.

Our health and safety laws, they're our line of defense against these dangers. We're not about to abandon them, not about to abandon them, because of people like you. You know, there's a couple of lines in the Bible that say, if your child asks for bread, would you give him a stone; if he asked for fish, would you give him a serpent; if he asked

for an egg would you give him a scorpion? Today we must ask, if our child asked about the future, will we give him or her dirty air, poison water; would we keep them from knowing what chemicals are being released into their neighborhoods and keep their parents from protecting them? We all know what the answer is. It's no.

It seems simple here in this wonderful neighborhood. Why don't you help us make it simple in Washington, DC?

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. at Fort Armistead Park. In his remarks, he referred to Doris McGuigan, environmental activist in the Brooklyn-Curtis Bay community of Baltimore, and Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr., president of the Maryland Senate.

Executive Order 12969—Federal Acquisition and Community Right-To-Know

August 8, 1995

The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11001–11050) ("EPCRA") and the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13101–13109) ("PPA") established programs to protect public health and the environment by providing the public with important information on the toxic chemicals being released into the air, land, and water in their communities by manufacturing facilities.

The Toxics Release Inventory ("TRI") established pursuant to section 313(j) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(j), based on information required to be reported under section 313 of EPCRA and section 6607 of PPA, 42 U.S.C. 13106, provides the public, industry, and Federal, State, and local governments with a basic tool for making risk-based decisions about management and control of toxic chemicals, that can have significant adverse effects on human health and the environment. TRI data allow the public, industry, and government to gauge the progress of industry and government efforts to reduce toxic chemical wastes.

Sharing vital TRI information with the public has provided a strong incentive for reduction in the generation, and, ultimately, re-

lease into the environment, of toxic chemicals. Since the inception of the TRI program, reported releases to the environment under TRI have decreased significantly.

The efficiency of the Federal Government is served when it purchases high quality supplies and services that have been produced with a minimum impact on the public health and environment of communities surrounding government contractors. Savings associated with reduced raw materials usage, reduced use of costly, inefficient end-of-pipeline pollution controls, and reduced liability and remediation costs from worker and community claims all serve to increase the economic and efficient provision of essential supplies and services to the government. As a result of TRI reporting, many manufacturers have learned of previously unrecognized significant efficiencies and cost savings in their production processes.

The Federal Government's receipt of timely and quality supplies and services is also served by the general enhancement of relations between government contractors and the communities in which they are situated, as well as the cooperative working relationship between employers and employees who may be subject to exposure to toxic materials.

Information concerning chemical release and transfer can assist the government to purchase efficiently produced, lower cost, and higher quality supplies and services that also have a minimum adverse impact on community health and the environment.

Now, Therefore, to promote economy and efficiency in government procurement of supplies and services, and by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11001 et seq., PPA, 42 U.S.C. 13101 et seq., 40 U.S.C. 471 and 486(a), and 3 U.S.C. 301, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Policy. It is the policy of the executive branch in procuring supplies and services that, to ensure the economical and efficient procurement of Federal Government contracts, Federal agencies, to the greatest extent practicable, shall contract with companies that report in a public man-

ner on toxic chemicals released to the environment.

Sec. 2. Definitions. 2-201. All definitions found in EPCRA and PPA and implementing regulations are incorporated into this order by reference, with the following exceptions for purposes of this order.

2-202. "*Federal agency*" means an "Executive agency," as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105. For purposes of this order, military departments, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 102, are covered under the auspices of the Department of Defense.

2-203. "*Acquisition*" means the acquiring by contract with appropriated funds of supplies or services (including construction) by and for the use of the Federal Government through purchase or lease, whether the supplies or services are already in existence or must be created, developed, demonstrated, and evaluated. Acquisition begins at the point when the Federal department or agency needs are established and includes the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs, solicitation and selection of sources, award of contracts, contract financing, contract performance, contract administration, and those technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency needs by contract.

2-204. "*Toxic chemical*" means a substance on the list described in section 313(c) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(c), as it exists on the effective date of this order.

2-205. "*Administrator*" means the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA").

2-206. "*Federal contractor*" means an entity that has submitted the successful bid or proposal in response to a competitive acquisition solicitation.

Sec. 3. Applicability. 3-301. Each Federal agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable, include in contract solicitations as an eligibility criterion for the award of competitive acquisition contracts expected to equal or exceed \$100,000 with the Federal contractors described in subsection 3-302, the requirement that such contractors must file (and continue to file for the life of the contract) a Toxic Chemical Release Form ("Form R"), as described in sections 313 (a) and (g) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023 (a) and

(g), for each toxic chemical manufactured, processed, or otherwise used by the Federal contractor at a facility, as described in section 313 of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023, and section 6607 of PPA, 42 U.S.C. 13106.

3-302. The Federal contractors subject to the eligibility criterion described in subsection 3-301 above are those who currently report to the TRI pursuant to section 313(b)(1)(A) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b)(1)(A), that is, manufacturers having Standard Industrial Classification Code ("SIC") designations of 20 through 39 (as in effect on July 1, 1985).

3-303. Each Federal agency shall find that a prospective Federal contractor has satisfied the requirement in subsection 3-301 if the contractor certifies in a solicitation that it:

(a) Does not manufacture, process, or otherwise use any toxic chemicals listed under section 313(c) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(c);

(b) Does not have 10 or more full-time employees as specified in section 313(b)(1)(A) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b)(1)(A);

(c) Does not meet the reporting thresholds established under section 313(f) of the EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(f); or

(d) Has complied fully with the reporting requirements of subsection 4-404.

3-304. Each Federal agency shall require the filings described in subsection 3-301 above to include information on all chemicals identified by the Administrator pursuant to section 313(c) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(c), as of the date of this order.

3-305. Each Federal agency may amend existing contracts, to the extent permitted by law and where practicable, to require the reporting of information specified in subsection 3-301 above.

3-306. As consistent with Title IV of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA), Public Law 103-355, and section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, 41 U.S.C. 403(11), the requirements of this order are only applicable to competitive acquisition contracts expected to equal or exceed \$100,000.

Sec. 4. Implementation. 4-401. Not later than September 30, 1995, the EPA shall publish in the *Federal Register* guidance for com-

pliance with this order, including applicability with respect to subcontractors.

4-402. Within 30 days of the issuance of the guidance provided for in subsection 4-401 above, each Federal agency shall include in all acquisition solicitations issued on or after the effective date of this order, the provisions necessary to effect this order.

4-403. For all contracts expected to exceed \$500,000, each Federal agency shall consult with the Administrator or the Administrator's designee when the agency believes it is not practicable to include the eligibility requirement of section 3-301 in the contract solicitation or award.

4-404. Each Federal agency shall require each Federal contractor designated in subsection 3-302 above to:

(a) Have included in its response to the contract solicitation a certification, as specified in the guidelines published pursuant to subsection 4-401 of this order, that it will (if awarded the contract) comply with the requirements of subsection 3-301; and

(b) File with the Administrator and each appropriate State pursuant to section 313(a) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(a), the information required by subsection 3-301, beginning on the next July 1 after the date on which the contract is awarded.

4-405. Information submitted to the EPA pursuant to subsection 4-404(b) above shall be subject to the trade secret protections provided by section 322 of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11042. Information that is not trade secret shall be made available to the public pursuant to sections 313 (h) and (j) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023 (h) and (j). The Administrator is directed to review reports submitted pursuant to this order to determine the appropriateness of any claims for trade secret protection.

4-406. When the Administrator determines that a Federal contractor has not filed the necessary forms or complete information as required by subsection 3-301 above, the Administrator or the Administrator's designee may recommend termination of the contract for convenience. The Administrator shall transmit that recommendation to the head of the contracting agency, and that agency shall consider the recommendation

and determine whether to terminate the contract. In carrying out this responsibility, the Administrator may investigate any subject Federal contractor to determine the adequacy of compliance with the provisions of this order and the Administrator's designee may hold such hearings, public or private, as the Administrator deems advisable to assist in the Administrator's determination of compliance.

4-407. Each contracting agency shall cooperate with the Administrator and provide such information and assistance as the Administrator may require in the performance of the Administrator's functions under this order.

4-408. Upon request and to the extent practicable, the Administrator shall provide technical advice and assistance to Federal agencies in order to assist in full compliance with this order.

Sec. 5. General Provisions. 5-501. The requirements of this order shall be implemented and incorporated in acquisition regulations, including the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), within 90 days after the effective date of this order.

5-502. This order is not intended, and should not be construed, to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or its employees. This order is not intended, however, to preclude judicial review of final agency decisions in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq.

5-503. This order shall be effective immediately and shall continue to be in effect until revoked.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
August 8, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
5:01 p.m., August 8, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on August 10.

Memorandum on Community Right-To-Know Initiatives

August 8, 1995

Memorandum for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Expediting Community Right-to-Know Initiatives

The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11001–11050) (“EPCRA”) and the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13101–13109) provide an innovative approach to protecting public health and the environment by ensuring that communities are informed about the toxic chemicals being released into the air, land, and water by manufacturing facilities. I am committed to the effective implementation of this law, because Community Right-to-Know protections provide a basic informational tool to encourage informed community-based environmental decision making and provide a strong incentive for businesses to find their own ways of preventing pollution.

The laws provide the Environmental Protection Agency with substantial authority to add to the Toxics Release Inventory under EPCRA: (1) new chemicals; (2) new classes of industrial facilities; and (3) additional types of information concerning toxic chemical use at facilities. Community Right-to-Know should be enhanced wherever possible as appropriate. EPA currently is engaged in an ongoing process to address potential facility expansion and the collection of use information. I am committed to a full and open process on the policy issues posed by EPA’s exercise of these authorities.

So that consideration of these issues can be fully accomplished during this Administration, I am directing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget and appropriate Federal agencies with applicable technical and functional expertise, as necessary, to take the following actions:

- (a) Continuation on an expedited basis of the public notice and comment rule-

making proceedings to consider whether, as appropriate and consistent with section 313(b) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b), to add to the list of Standard Industrial Classification (“SIC”) Code designations of 20 through 39 (as in effect on July 1, 1985). For SIC Code designations, see “Standard Industrial Classification Manual” published by the Office of Management and Budget. EPA shall complete the rulemaking process on an accelerated schedule.

(b) Development and implementation of an expedited, open, and transparent process for consideration of reporting under EPCRA on information on the use of toxic chemicals at facilities, including information on mass balance, materials accounting, or other chemical use data, pursuant to section 313(b)(1)(A) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b)(1)(A). EPA shall report on the progress of this effort by October 1, 1995, with a goal of obtaining sufficient information to be able to make informed judgments concerning implementation of any appropriate program.

These actions should continue unless specifically prohibited by law. The head of each executive department or agency shall assist the Environmental Protection Agency in implementing this directive as quickly as possible.

This directive is for the internal management of the executive branch and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any person.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized and directed to publish this Memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11 a.m., August 10, 1995]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on August 11.

Statement on Welfare Reform

August 8, 1995

Six months ago, I convened a Presidential conference on welfare at the Blair House. Democrats and Republicans from the Congress to the State houses came to Washington to forge a bipartisan agreement on welfare.

At the conference we agreed on the need for child support to be a part of any welfare reform legislation. Now, the bill passed in the House and the legislation in the Senate includes comprehensive child support reform.

Since the conference, we have agreed to drop any inclusion of orphanages in welfare reform. Since the conference, we have agreed to require teen moms to live at home and stay in school as a condition to receiving welfare. Since the conference, we have agreed that all recipients must sign a work contract as a condition upon receiving benefits.

In addition to the progress we have made on a bipartisan basis of what welfare reform legislation must include, I have signed a sweeping Executive order concerning child support collection from delinquent parents. My administration is collecting a record amount of child support, making responsibility a way of life, not an option.

This year alone I have approved a dozen welfare reform experiments. The experiments have included new proposals, among them: requiring people to work for their benefits, requiring teen moms to stay at home and in school, requiring welfare recipients to be held to a time limit, requiring delinquent parents to pay child support, and requiring people on welfare to sign a contract which would hold them accountable to finding a job. The State experiments now total 32 States reaching 7 million individuals.

It is time to put partisanship and politics aside and to get the job done. The American people deserve real welfare reform and have been kept waiting long enough. We need a bipartisan bill that ends welfare and replaces it with work. I hope the Senate will place welfare at the top of its agenda in September and take swift action.

While Congress continues to debate welfare, I will proceed with the far-reaching wel-

fare reforms I initiated with the States over the last 2 years. We will continue to move people from welfare to work. We will continue to require teen moms to stay in school and live at home as a condition of their benefits. I call on this Congress to join me in a bipartisan endeavor, with politics aside and the national interest at the center of our efforts.

Remarks to the Progressive National Baptist Convention in Charlotte, North Carolina

August 9, 1995

Thank you. Mr. President Smith, I'm glad you explained that whole thing because here I was about to speak, I'd let enough time go by between Gardner Taylor and me that you could maybe forget some of my—[*laughter*]*—and then you said, we're going to wait until after he speaks to sing "Oh Happy Day."* [*Laughter*] But I think I understand it.

To all the vice presidents and your convention secretary and Reverend Booth and many of my friends who are here, Reverend Otis Moss, Reverend Charles Adams, Reverend Billy Kyles and Reverend Shepard. To my wonderful friend Reverend Gardner Taylor, thank you for what you said. I intend to tell the story of the hound dog and the hare. [*Laughter*] Where appropriate, I will give you credit. [*Laughter*] To Governor Jim Hunt—ladies and gentlemen, Jim Hunt may be the most popular Governor in America. He's certainly one of the two or three finest Governors in America, and a great friend of mine. We're glad to have him here. In 1979—that was a long time ago—when I had no gray hair and he had much less—[*laughter*]*—he nominated me to be the vice chairman of the Democratic Governors Association. No one knew who I was. I was 33 years old. And if it hadn't been for that, I might not be here today. Now, that may get him in a lot of trouble down here for all I know, but I will always be grateful to Jim Hunt for the role he had in my life and the role he's had in the life of this State and Nation.*

I have looked forward to coming here. I feel at home. Most people down here don't

speaking with an accent; I like that. [Laughter] And since I'm at home I want to talk about something I have been trying to deal with all across America lately, and that is, how are we going to find the common ground we need to walk the road we have to walk together? How can we rise above our differences and march into the future together?

You've set a good example here. I understand this is the first ever joint meeting between the Progressive Baptist Convention and the Alliance of Baptists. This will have a lot of subsidiary good benefits. For example, it's doing those white folks up there a world of good to sing in a choir like that. [Laughter and applause] That may be a racially insensitive, politically incorrect remark, but having spent countless hours of my life in Baptist church choirs, I do know what I am talking about. [Laughter] I can't believe I said that. [Laughter] "A happy heart doeth good like medicine." [Laughter]

I do believe as strongly as I can say that we have to fight for common ground instead of fight to tear each other apart. And I say that not because I have suffered my share of slings and arrows as President in the absence of common ground—it's just an honor to show up for work every day. St. Paul said that God put a thorn in his flesh so he would not be exalted in his own eyes. If that is the test, I feel downright humble today. [Laughter]

Whether we like it or not, we are all in this together. Whether we like it or not, we are an American family, and we behave like a good family or a bad family, or a little bit of both, but we are a family. We have to get together. That's why I made the speech I did on affirmative action. Let's don't get away from something that's helping us until we don't need it anymore. I thought it was important to tell the American people that everything is not equal in terms of opportunity in our country today, even though the laws have changed, and also important to remind people about what affirmative action is and isn't. It's not about quotas. It's not about unqualified people getting anything. It's not about reverse discrimination. All of that is illegal and will not be tolerated wherever we can find it.

We ought to shift more efforts to help people just because they're poor, without regard to their race or gender. But we need to recognize that we have to have ways to make sure we're going forward together. The future really should be America's best time. Here we are living in this global society where information goes around the world in a split second. We flip on CNN; we know what they're doing in some country we couldn't find on a map 6 months ago. It's great.

But if we're going to be a global village, what country is in a better position to do well than the one that is the most racially, ethnically, religiously diverse, with the most powerful private sector in the world, the United States. If we can find a way to get along together and to work together and solve our problems together, our best days are before us. That is what is at issue here.

And we know that affirmative action won't amount to anything if we don't deal with our big problems. We don't want to be part of a lot of Americans fighting over a shrinking pie. We don't want to be one of these families with a whole lot of heirs and the estate's going down. We want to be a family where everybody has a brighter future. So that means we have to deal with the economic problems of the American family, the social problems of the American family. And it means we have to be candid in saying that we can't make up for the shortcomings of our individual families or churches or communities unless they do their part.

And that's what I want to talk to you about today. There's been a lot of talk for 15 or 20 years now about family values. What are the family values of the American family, and what do they compel us to do right now, today, this day, and tomorrow when we get up in the morning and God gives us another day of life? What do they say we ought to do? Are we going to use this discussion of family values this year and next to lift up or to tear down, to unite or to divide? Is it going to be a weapon of words to harden the hearts of some Americans against another, or is it going to be a way of asking ourselves what's this family all about?

Some folks like this family values issue because they get to preach at other people.

They get to preach against violence and premature sex and teen pregnancy, and they get to preach against the media promoting such things. They get to preach against drugs and crime. They get to tell people, "Behave." Now, that's not all bad. But is it enough?

Some folks like this issue because, frankly, they are working hard to keep their own families together, to keep body and soul together, to pay their bills, raise their kids, take care of their parents, and they'd like a little help from their Government or their community or from their church.

But raising a family—what's it about? Isn't it fundamentally—think about your own family. Isn't raising a family fundamentally about the obligations we owe to other people in the family? Isn't it fundamentally about the responsibility we have to fulfill those obligations and then to behave in such a way that we can make the most of our own lives? And if we're going to talk about the family values of America, shouldn't we talk about it like that? Isn't that what the American family ought to be about, the obligations we owe to other members of the family, the responsibilities we have to fulfill those obligations, and the responsibility we have to conduct our lives so that we can live up to the fullest of our God-given capacities?

Now, that means that we can stand some good preaching, but we've got to be good Samaritans, too. It also means that when we look at our neighbor and we see that sty in his or her eye, we've got to make sure the beam's out of ours.

But these problems—the point I'm trying to make is that all these problems we face as an American family or in our individual family, they have a moral aspect which needs some preaching and behaving, and they have a communal aspect which may need a little help from Samaritans.

You look at the teen pregnancy problem. People obviously have to make a decision not to do that. We can't make that decision for them. They have to make that decision and people have to be—[applause]—that's a matter of personal ethics and discipline and values. And we're just kidding ourselves if we pretend that there's some picture-pretty social program that will solve this.

On the other hand, when people do want to behave, they're entitled to a little help from their friends, from their Samaritans. If a young girl has a child and wants to get off welfare and wants to go to school or go to work, then there has to be some child care. So you need—if you want to fight the crime problem, you've got to punish those who do wrong, but you also have to take these kids who are in severe, severely difficult circumstances, at great risk of doing wrong, and give them something to say yes to, something to be hopeful about.

You know, a couple of years ago when we passed the crime bill, which had the toughest punishments in history, we put more money into prevention programs than ever before. And the people who opposed us ridiculed us in the name of something called midnight basketball. As far as I know, nobody has ever been arrested playing midnight basketball for dealing dope on a basketball court with an adult supervisor there.

So who are we trying to kid here? Let's take it the other way. Look at an economic problem. It can also become a moral problem. The fact is most families in the American family are working families. Most poor people in America are now living in working families. And most people are working longer hours today than they were 10 years ago for the same or lower wages. Now, that's a fact. Now, you say, that's an economic fact. Well, it can become a moral fact if people who are working harder for less have less time and energy, not to mention money, to invest in their children and their education, to keep their kids out of trouble, to do what they want to do.

I never will forget a few years ago, every time I ran for office at home in Arkansas, I used to make it a point to go to the earliest factory gate in my State—Campbell Soup factory in northwest Arkansas. People started going to work there at 4:30 a.m., and I figured if I'd show up between 4:30 and a quarter to 5 and shake hands with everybody on that shift, somebody would say, "Well, if that guy's fool enough to do this we ought to give him a vote." [Laughter] And it worked. [Laughter] And so I did it. But I never will forget, one day I was there quarter to 5 in the morning; pickup truck pulls up outside

the factory; the door opens, a light comes on inside the pickup truck. There's this really attractive young couple there. The young wife is going to work; the husband is driving off. They have three little kids in that pickup truck, in the front seat. And I said, now what are you going to do? He said, well, my wife has to be at work; she has to check in by 5 a.m. every morning. And I have to be at work by 7 a.m. So I have to find somebody who will take my children at 6:30, which most child care people won't. So I've got to now go back home, make breakfast for these kids, get them there, and then drop them off at the child care center. Then I've got to show up at 7 a.m.

Now, that's maybe an extreme example, but not an atypical example of the way most families live today. Isn't that right? Most people are working today. So I would argue to you that that's an economic issue that has become a moral issue. How can our society succeed unless people can be good parents and good workers? And if we have to choose one or the other, who's going to fall between the cracks? The kids. We live in a world where we must not make people choose. We have to succeed at both.

Now, for 2½ years that's what I have been working at. That's why I want to bring this deficit down and balance the budget. That's why I tried to create jobs with investments and special incentives for people to put money into poor areas and expanding trade so we could sell more of our stuff around the world. That's why I tried to increase education from Head Start to kids, to more affordable college loans and scholarships and national service for kids to go to college. That's why we're putting money into the fight against crime and the war against drugs, for education and training and treatment and also to try to crack down on people who are importing these drugs into our country. That's why we're doing that. That's why we passed the family and medical leave law, the symbol of being a successful parent and a successful worker. Why should you lose your job if your kid gets sick? Why should you do that—and you've got to go home and take care of them? Why we want to immunize all the children in this country under the age of 2 and why we bailed out a very sick pen-

sion system in America and saved 8½ million people's retirements and protected 40 million other people's retirement up the road—because those are all family values to me.

And we have, as a result, 7 million jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 1½ million new businesses, the largest number of new millionaires in a 2-year period in history. Unemployment's down. Inflation's down. African-American unemployment's below 10 percent for the first time since the Vietnam war. And people are not working at fighting. In almost every major area of this country, the crime rate is down. And divorce is down. The country is beginning to come back together.

If that's true, why aren't we happy? Because many people are still, in fact, less secure. And many of our families are less secure, because underneath those statistics, the rising tide is not lifting all boats. And a huge number of people are being left out of this nice picture. And it's going to affect all the rest of us, just like any other family.

You know, I'm really proud of my little brother, but he once had a terrible drug problem, and it affected all the rest of us. We didn't get off scot-free because we didn't find a way to solve this problem. It wasn't his problem; it was our problem. That's the way it is with America. It's our problem.

When companies—their profits are up and they're still downsizing and laying people off, that's our problem. That's our problem. When we see people losing their health care even though they still got jobs—the only place—we're the only rich country in the world where that's happening—that's our problem. When people are faced with dealing with their parents or educating their children, that would be our problem, not just their problem. What's happening with crime and drugs is that the overall statistics are going down, but the rate of random, violent crime associated by very young teenagers is going way up. And people feel that, and it scares them. And it's our problem. The rate of random, careless, casual drug use is going up, even though a lot of the statistics are going down. Young, young teenagers are in big trouble in this country.

Now, we've got to decide how to deal with it. If all we do is preach, we can play on

our anxiety and our anger, and we can divide one from another, and we can fight over a shrinking economic pie. And it may be a wonderfully successful electoral strategy, but it won't solve anything. We go through another set of elections where nothing gets better. People vent their steam and express their fears and their anger, but nothing ever changes.

So you see it today. People say, "Well, the American family would be all right if it weren't for the immigrants or if it weren't for the people on welfare or if it weren't for the affirmative action program giving all the money to people who aren't qualified or if it weren't for the Government throwing all our money away.

Now, what I want to say to you is the same thing I said about affirmative action. We have problems in immigration. We've got no business spending money on illegal immigrants. We should not—people who wait for years to get into this country lawfully should not be leaped over by people who just cross over because they can get in. That's not right. And our administration has put more effort into sealing our borders and sending illegal immigrants back and people that come into the criminal justice system who aren't here legally than anybody has in a long time.

It is true that people shouldn't be on welfare if they can also be working. That's also true. And we have done more than any administration in history to move people from welfare to work. It's also true that, as I said before, we have to make some changes in the affirmative action program so we can keep it and make it work right. That's all true.

And finally, it's true that there is waste in Government. But our administration has cut more out than anybody has in over 20 years. The point I want to make is, if you do all that, it still won't solve the problems unless you deal with these fundamental problems of the American family: What are the fundamental economic problems? What are the fundamental social problems? And how can we deal with them together? That's what our job is. We need to start acting like family members, do our part and ask what our obligations are.

So let me say—the other day I tried to do this at the American Federation of Teach-

ers convention. I'm going to try again. Here's what I think the family values of America in 1995 ought to be and what we can do about them in Government. And then you ask yourself, what can you do about them?

Number one, if you were running a family right, you wouldn't saddle your kids with unnecessary debt. In other words, if you borrow money, you're borrowing it to buy a house, finance an education, build a new business, but you wouldn't borrow it to go out to eat on the weekend. That's what this country's been doing. We ought to balance the budget. It's the right thing to do.

But if you're running a family right you'd, first and foremost, try to take care of your children. Now, our children—[*applause*—our children don't need to balance the budget on their backs. We don't have to cut Head Start or college loans and make it more expensive to educate the children to balance the budget. We can do them both.

The third thing that you want your family to do is to take care of your parents. I mean, after all, they raised you, right? And in the American family, we decided a long time ago we would take care of our parents from middle class and lower middle class people and even through pretty well-to-do people, largely through Medicare and Medicaid. Medicare pays for hospital care, and then if you buy into the second part of it, it pays for doctor visits, a number of other things. And Medicaid pays for people who have to go into nursing homes. That's about two-thirds of the cost; that's how we pay for it.

Now, we don't have to balance the budget by exploding the cost of Medicare to ordinary people. You know 75 percent of the people on Medicare are living on incomes of under \$25,000. We don't have to increase their premiums, their co-pays, their deductibles to make it so they don't have enough money to live on. We don't have to make their children pay even more than they're already paying in the payroll tax. All the children are paying for Medicare now; they're paying for it in the payroll tax. We don't have to make them pay more, which means that they will have—how are they going to educate their kids if they have to pay twice through Medicare?

So I'm telling you, do we have to make some changes in Medicare? Yeah, we do. Why? Because we're living longer and more of us are getting older. But do we have to absolutely bankrupt the elderly people in this country to balance the budget? No, we don't. And we shouldn't do it. It violates our family values.

What's the fourth thing we've got to do? I already said it. In the world we're living in today, most people do not have an option, they have to work. We spent a lot of time and energy trying to get people from welfare to work. Most people are trying to find work. Most people on welfare want to go to work. Most people in jobs are trying to keep the one they've got or get a better one. Isn't that right? That's the normal thing in life. So the problem most people have is, how am I going to keep my job or get a better one and be a good parent? How can I do the right thing by our children? So what should we do?

We should keep the family and medical leave law, for one thing. It's a good law. We should make it possible for everybody who works 40 hours a week and has a child in the home not to be in poverty. If people leave welfare and they show up for work every day and they've got kids in the house, what kind of message does it send to them if they're in poverty? It's not the right message. So in 1993, we changed the tax law, and we said, we're going to give a tax credit, a working family tax credit. Today, for every family of four in America with an income of \$28,000 a year or less, the tax bill is \$1,000 lower than it was before I took office because we don't believe people who work 40 hours a week and have kids should be in poverty. We should increase that program. The last thing we should do is do what some people want to do and cut back on that program. We should reward people who are doing their best at working and parenting.

We ought to change the health care system. We're the only country in the world where working families are losing health care every year. We ought to change the rules so that if you change jobs, you don't lose your health care. If you have somebody in your family get sick, you cannot be cut off. And people ought to get a little help to keep their parents out of nursing homes as well as help

pay for them when they get in them. We can do that and still balance the budget.

And the last thing we ought to do, I believe strongly, is raise the minimum wage. It's too low. If we don't raise the minimum wage next year, in terms of its ability to buy things, it will be at a 40-year low, a 40-year low. I don't know about you, but my idea of the 21st century is an exciting, high-tech deal where there are all these gadgets that I don't even know how to work, but my daughter and all my grandchildren, they'll be working them like crazy and doing well. My idea of the 21st century is not a hard-work, low-wage dead-end society. Let's raise the minimum wage. We can go forward together. That's what family members do. That's our obligation to people who are out there doing that kind of work the rest of us don't want to do. That's part of our family obligations.

The next thing we ought to do is when we cut taxes we ought to make it support families. My tax cut program gives people a tax cut for raising kids and for educating their children and themselves, families, pro-family. And we ought to say we know some people are going to lose their jobs in all this downsizing. It's always happened, and now it seems to be happening a little more. But when people lose their jobs, if they're working people, the least we can do is guarantee them a right to immediately—not to wait until their unemployment runs out—immediately, immediately get more education. And I have proposed a GI bill for America's workers that would allow any unemployed person in the country that loses a job to get a voucher worth \$2,500 or so a year and take it to the local community college for up to 2 years to get education and training. That's a family value. That's a family value.

Just a couple of other things. I believe—you know, in our family, we were raised—I was raised in the South. You can tell by the way I talk, especially after I'm around you for a while and get in a good humor. [Laughter] We were raised to love the land, to love the water, to believe that we had to live in harmony with it, to cut the trees in a way that there'd still be trees a generation from now, to till the land in a way that there would still be topsoil for our grandchildren. That's what we were raised to do. And I be-

lieve part of our family values should be teaching our people to preserve our environment. And I don't understand this new obsession in Washington with ripping out all the protections for the environment and for the public health and safety, for clean food, clean water, clean air. I don't understand that. I don't understand that.

And the last thing I want to say is, it seems to me that the American family has got to be focusing on social problems we have that affect our children especially, especially. What are our obligations there? And on these I need your help because there's only so much the Government can do, although there are things the Government can do. We were, most of us, raised to know what the seven deadly sins were. Remember that? Pride, lust, gluttony, sloth, avarice, anger, envy. Anger and gluttony: Those are the two I have to work on all the time. *[Laughter]* We've all got our little list, don't we?

But I would like to point out that there are four things that are threatening our children that could be deadly sins to them: violence; the problem of teen pregnancy, for the young fathers as well as the young mothers; smoking—something people don't often think about, I want to talk about that a little bit; and drugs. And I want to say we have to think about the children. Families are fundamentally the device through which we perpetuate ourselves. They're really about children. They're organized to raise children. And nobody in all of human history has ever come up with an appropriate, adequate substitute. Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me and do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."

When they come, what do you do? Luke 11, "If a child asks for bread, would you give him a stone? If he asks for a fish, would you give him a serpent? If he asks for an egg, would you give him a scorpion?" That's what the kids of this country are being given, a whole lot of them.

Look at violence. Every 2 hours in this country a child dies of a gunshot wound. Last year in Washington we had a 13-year-old honor student just standing at the bus stop shot down because he just happened to be in the middle of two gangs that were fighting. Homicide is the leading cause of death

among African-American males between the ages of 15 and 24. The number of people arrested for murder is going down among those older than 25, but going up for juveniles and young adults. The number of juveniles—juveniles—arrested for murder increased 168 percent between 1984 and 1993.

In one of our newspapers the other day there was this incredible story about a 16-year-old boy who shot a 12-year-old boy dead because he thought he was showing him disrespect. All this boy's friends, the 12-year-old boy's friends, said that's the way he treated everybody, he was a jokester. The 16-year-old felt insecure. They had one incident, nothing happened. They had another incident; he pulled out the gun and shot him when he was running away and then stood over his body and emptied the gun into his body.

Now, this happened just a couple of days after there was this great national survey, a very fascinating survey of young gang members in which two-thirds of these young men honestly said, quite openly, they thought it was all right to shoot somebody who disrespected you. If that's all right I'd be plum out of bullets; the whole country would be. *[Laughter]* We're laughing, but this is deadly serious. How many of us—how many times were we raised with, when you get mad count to 10 before you open your mouth? Don't you say that; don't you do that? That's how we were raised up. Who's telling these kids to count to 10?

What's happening out there? How can two-thirds of the kids who belong to these gangs think it's okay to shoot somebody for some word they say? Whatever happened to sticks and stones can break my bones, but words will never hurt me? Whatever happened to people being told to define themselves from the inside out, not from the outside in? Whatever happened to all that?

I'm doing what I can. Look, when we passed that crime bill last year a lot of Members of Congress literally gave up their seats in Congress and gave up their careers to vote for that crime bill, because it banned assault weapons. And they were taken out. I'm telling you, the NRA took them out in the last election. And they did it for your children. Most of these people came from rural dis-

tricts where their voters didn't understand and they could be stampeded because they didn't know anybody with an assault weapon. And they figured if somebody bought one and wanted to take it to a shooting contest they ought to have a right to. And they were spooked, and a lot of them voted against these good Members of Congress. But they did it for our kids who are living in these cities where these kids are being gunned down. They said, "If it costs me my career to get the uzis out of the high school, I'll give it up."

Now, that was a great thing. That was an important thing. And that bill gave some money to community groups for crime prevention programs and for job programs and for things to give these kids something to say yes to. We're doing what we can, but you know and I know we can put 100,000 more police on the street, we can ban assault weapons, we can have the Brady bill, we can have these funds for community programs—and I hope we can save them, by the way, in this Congress—but the parents still have to be there, or if they're not there, the churches, somebody has got to be there to teach these kids right from wrong. Somebody has got to say, "I don't care what they call you, it is better to live to be 70 years old and have children and grandchildren and have a useful full life. What difference does it make what they call you?" Somebody has to be there to do that. And we've all got to do that together.

Yes, there are some other things we can do. The other day—we're in a big argument in Washington now—I think we're going to win this one because it's not partisan—about the influence that our culture has. You know, are kids exposed to too much violence in the movies and principally on television, because that's how most people watch it? And I think the answer is, yes, they are. Of course they are.

But the answer to this is not simply to condemn but to ask the people who are making these movies to help us and to ask the people who are showing them to us to help us. And now, with all the wonders of technology, we know that everybody who has cable TV can get something called the V-chip which would allow every family to determine which chan-

nels or even programs within channels they don't want their little children to watch. Kids get numb to violence. If by the time you're 6 or 7 years old, you've seen thousands and thousands and thousands of people shot down on the street, it numbs you. So we ought to pass this law and require the V-chip and give families the right to program for their children. It's a family right.

But in the end, we have to do this together. And if we don't deal with this, all the rest of this stuff is just like whistling "Dixie" because you can't bring one of these kids back. In this life, you cannot see them again once they're dead. So we must—this is something we must commit to do together. And this ought not to be a partisan issue. It ought not to be a racial issue. It ought not to be a regional issue. We have to do something about the rapid growth in violence among our very young people.

The second thing I want to talk about a minute is teen pregnancy. Every year a million young girls between the ages of 15 and 19 become pregnant. Some of them are married, but most of them aren't. Eighty percent of the children born to unwed teenagers who dropped out of school, 80 percent of them live in poverty. It is literally true that if teenagers who are unmarried didn't have babies and all babies were born into families where at least one person both had a job and a high-school education, you would cut the poverty rate by more than 50 percent in America. The new poor in America are young mothers and their little children.

In the last 2½ years, we've worked hard on this. And our welfare reform program sends a clear signal to young people. I believe if people are going to draw welfare when they are young and unmarried, we should say, this is not so you can go out and set up your own household and perpetuate this. Unless you have a bad situation at home, you ought to have to live at home and stay in school or stay at work to take the check.

And I think we should hold fathers more accountable. There's a lot of child abuse in teen pregnancy. At least half the babies born to teenage girls are fathered by men who are 20 or older. That's child abuse. That's not right. It's not right. And even young men—even young men—there was a young man

in our hometown in Arkansas before I moved here who made a mistake and fathered a child. He was a young man in school. But you know, that kid got up every day before school and went to work and every day after school went back to work and gave all that money to the child. We need more people doing that. That's the kind of thing that we have got to have happen. We need to be, all of us, for very, very tough child support enforcement. We cannot tolerate people who won't take care of their own children. Eight-hundred thousand people could move off welfare if we just enforced the child support laws of the United States of America. And we need to be for that.

But I will say again, I can't solve this problem with a Government fix. This is about how people behave and whether they get personal, personal, one-on-one kinds of reassurance. I am working to get all the leaders of all sectors of our society involved in this fight. But what I want to say is we know there are things that work. The Teen Health Connection here working with low-income teenagers right here in Charlotte has made a real difference. Dr. Henry Foster's "I Have A Future" program has made a real difference.

And I want to say, by the way, I thank you for standing behind Henry Foster. He is a good man, and I'm glad you've got him coming here. And I'm going to do my best to keep him involved in this struggle because he has proved—I saw those young people. I saw those kids from the housing projects in Nashville, Tennessee. A lot of them didn't have a nickel to their names, and they got on a bus and they left their lives, they left what they were doing, and they rode to Washington to tell the United States Senate they ought not to let politics keep Henry Foster from becoming Surgeon General, because he had changed their lives. He had ended the epidemic of teen pregnancy and violence and had given them a chance to start a better future. That's what we need more of.

The same thing is true of drugs. Let me just give you this. In the latest survey of drug use among 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, 43 percent of high school seniors had used an illegal drug by the time they reached their senior year. Marijuana, LSD, inhalants, like

glue and aerosol—that stuff people did when I was barely out of high school—all these things are coming back. And the feeling that these drugs are dangerous is going down in these surveys. Same people, two-thirds of them who say we can go out and shoot somebody that disrespects us say, "Oh, this stuff's not dangerous."

Now, we are now doing more than a National Government's ever done to fight drugs, based on cutting off the source in foreign governments. You probably saw in the press this week another drug kingpin busted in Colombia. We work hard on that, and we are making real progress on that. But you also have to do things here at home. You've got to punish the real serious offenders here at home. But you have to have some sort of treatment, education, and prevention programs as well. Therefore, I am opposed to these efforts in the Congress to balance the budget by cutting 23 million students out of the safe schools and drug-free schools program.

You know, I bet a lot of you had your children come home and tell you how much they liked their D.A.R.E. officer in the school talking about staying off drugs. A lot of these police officers that are going into these schools are the best role models a lot of these young kids have. And we need to support this sort of thing. We don't need to walk away from it. And you have to help. You have got to make sure that every single, solitary school in this country has a good, safe and drug-free schools program. You have got to do that. Whatever we do in Washington, you have got to do that.

The last thing I want to talk about is smoking. And I want to tell you why I want to talk about it. I know that tobacco is very important to the economy of this fine State. And I've worked hard to help the economy of this and every other State. And there are a lot of wonderful people in this country who make a living as tobacco farmers and their families have for a couple of hundred years. That's important to understand.

But we cannot pretend that we're ignoring the evidence. One of the greatest threats to the health of our children is teenage smoking, and it's rising. Listen to this, every single day 3,000 young people become regular

smokers and nearly 1,000 of them will die prematurely as a result. For more than a decade, even as adult smoking was dropping, the smoking rate among high school seniors did not go down. That was bad enough. But since 1991, the percentage of teenage smokers has risen steadily and rapidly. There's been a 30-percent increase in the 8th graders who smoke, a 22-percent increase in the number of 10th graders who smoke, and by the age of 16, the average teenage smoker is smoking every day and will not stop. If you wanted to do something to reduce the cost of health care, help over the long run to balance the budget, and increase the health care of America, having no teenagers smoke would be the cheapest, easiest, quickest thing you could ever do to change the whole dynamic of health care in America.

Now, again I will tell you, it's just like the drugs and the gangs; the number of teenagers who believe smoking is dangerous is dropping dramatically. There's a lot more peer approval. This also is a recipe for disaster. There are some things we can do at the governmental level, and we'll be talking about that in the near future. But what I want to say to you is this is just another example of where, no matter what you do with the law, people have to change inside, and somebody has to help them change inside. And we have to do it in an organized, disciplined way.

James Baldwin once said, "Children have never been very good at listening to their elders." As a parent, that's comforting to know. [Laughter] "But," he said, "they have never failed to imitate them."

So, I say to you what I said at the beginning. We are on the verge of the 21st century. It should be America's century. The best days of this country should be before us. If we recognize that we're a family and we're going forward, up, or down together, we will go up and forward together.

But we have to ask ourselves, what are our family values, and what do we in the American family value, and what are we going to do about it? Today I've tried to tell you what I intend to do about it. And I ask you to say, what are you going to do about it and how are you going to continue to work.

I want to say a special word of thanks to our host pastor, Reverend Diggs, because I know that he has worked in this community to try to make a difference on these issues. And so many of you have.

You've got this alliance of these two groups here meeting today. We need this kind of alliance on these problems, the kind of problems that our children are facing at the grass-roots level. They know no racial barrier; they know no income barrier even; they certainly know no regional barrier. We have got to get over this using family values to drive a stake between us as American people and let it lift us up. We have got to do that.

And I ask you to leave here determined to do what you can to be good preachers and good Samaritans and good examples, to make the family of America a place where family values lifts us up, pulls us together, and takes us into the future. We can walk and not faint. We can run and not grow weary. And if we do not lose heart, we shall reap.

God bless you all, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:48 p.m. at the Charlotte Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Bennett W. Smith, Sr., president, and Rev. Gardner C. Taylor, former president, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Memorandum on the President's Oklahoma City Scholarship Fund

August 9, 1995

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive
Departments and Agencies*

*Subject: The President's OKC Scholarship
Fund*

The tragic bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City took 168 lives and permanently damaged many more. The families of the dead and injured, even witnesses and rescue workers, had their lives changed by that irrational and despicable act of violence.

In the aftermath of this national tragedy, however, we can be proud of the abiding strength and resilience demonstrated by the American people. The days and weeks that followed the explosion witnessed an outpour-

ing of love and support for the victims and their families as Americans of every age, region, and background rallied to assist them.

A number of Federal agencies and public charities established funds to provide emergency assistance for the bombing victims and their families. However, in addition to the provision of relief for the immediate needs of the victims, I am concerned about providing for the education of the children whose parent or parents died or were severely disabled as a result of the bombing. Consequently, I have asked the Federal Employee Education and Assistance Fund (the "FEEA"), a private charity, to establish the President's OKC Scholarship Fund (the "Scholarship Fund"), which will be administered as part of its existing Oklahoma Fund, solely for the provision of educational needs of those children.

The Scholarship Fund will accept donations from all sources and 100 percent of all contributions will be distributed for the benefit of the eligible children. The FEEA will establish an Advisory Board to help direct financial assistance from the Scholarship Fund, to advise the FEEA concerning eligibility criteria, and to provide such information and advice as the Board of Directors of the FEEA may require. As set forth in a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the FEEA, either I or my designee will recommend persons for appointment to the Advisory Board.

Those who wish to contribute to the Scholarship Fund should send donations to the FEEA; checks should be earmarked "The President's OKC Scholarship Fund." The FEEA's mailing address is: Suite 200, 8441 West Bowles, Littleton, Colorado 80123.

The Federal family has again come together in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, with contributions of money, clothing, annual leave, and even blood. I hope we will be just as generous in supporting the education of the innocent children whose parents were killed or disabled in this terrible act.

I urge each of you to support the Scholarship Fund and encourage your employees to do likewise.

William J. Clinton

Remarks to the Black Enterprise Magazine 25th Anniversary Gala August 9, 1995

Thank you, Earl. I'm delighted to be with you, and I appreciate your introduction. It is I who should be thanking you tonight and many of those who are there with you for your incredible effort over so many years, and especially for your valuable input and support on the affirmative action policy.

I also want to say hello to my Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown. I'm glad you applauded him. He certainly is one of the finest Secretaries of Commerce this country ever had. He has done more to promote jobs and businesses for all Americans than anybody has in a long time. I want to say hello to Dr. Earl Richardson, the President of Morgan State. To Tom Labrecque of Chase Manhattan Bank, thank you for being there and for your work. Reverend Jackson, I'm sorry I missed your prayer. I need it more than anybody who's there. [Laughter] I'm sorry I missed it. Mayor Schmoke, Governor Wilder, I enjoyed being with you a few days ago. And to my longtime friend Maynard Jackson, and to all the Graves family and all my friends who are gathered there tonight to honor your achievements, Earl, I want to send my best wishes.

I also know that I speak for all of you when we offer our best wishes to someone who had planned to be with you tonight—our prayers and best wishes are with David Dinkins. We wish him well, and we know he's going to be all right.

Earl, I want to add my congratulations to you and to Black Enterprise for 25 years of leadership in African-American business. This evening celebrates initiative, achievement, and opportunity. Initiative has always been the American genius, and Earl, you have set a singular example of that kind of genius. And because of your example, countless African-Americans have been empowered to take advantage of opportunity, to achieve. A life of accomplishment has exponential impact, and you, Earl Graves, have proved that.

A quarter century ago, you and Black Enterprise began to fill a large void for African-Americans who needed a source for informa-

tion, encouragement, and guidance, to become entrepreneurs and to succeed in business. And over the years Black Enterprise has helped dreams to become reality. I know it will continue to do so for more African-Americans for many, many more years to come.

It's fitting that this anniversary is being celebrated with another important initiative by Earl Graves and that is to build up business education at one of our Nation's finest historically black universities, Morgan State. That's an investment that will pay great dividends for the next generation and beyond and I hope one that will encourage others to follow Earl's lead and to do their part to help expand opportunities in business and education for African-Americans. When we do that, all of America benefits.

I declared the last week in September Minority Enterprise Development Week to call attention to an important avenue to economic empowerment in America. But the fact is, we should be celebrating and promoting business growth in minority communities every day of the year. This business growth is essential for our continued prosperity, and it's the right way to create wealth, to encourage self-sufficiency, to generate jobs, and to build our people up and to build our communities up.

Our administration is working hard to strengthen all our Nation's businesses. We've opened new domestic and international markets, due in no small part to the hard work of Ron Brown and all those at the Commerce Department who have helped to expand the opportunities for American businesses. We've reduced the cost of borrowing for business start-ups and for expansions. While the Small Business Administration has cut its budget by 40 percent, it has doubled its loan output and increased its loan output to minority businesses and women by almost 80 percent.

Now, all this is making an impact. Overall, new businesses are growing as never before. And since 1992, nearly 100,000 new African-American businesses have been created in the United States. By 1997, according to the Census Bureau, there will be 717,000 African-American businesses in America, the result of the largest increase in any 5-year pe-

riod. That's an accomplishment to be proud of, and I would tell you that if we get another 4 years to work on the economy, the number may be bigger than that.

Last month, as Earl said, I reaffirmed America's need for affirmative action, including set-asides for minority business owners in Federal contract procurement. I did it because I believe our country still needs this tool to address the limits of opportunity which still exist in our society, based on gender and race. I did it because I believe we'll be stronger if every American has a chance to live up to his or her God-given abilities.

We must have a mission, a national mission at the end of this century to restore the American dream of opportunity and the American value of responsibility. We must have a mission to do this together. We've got a big decision to make about whether we're going forward together or not. Whether we like it or not, we're all in the future together. We are a national family, whether we like it or not. And we're going forward, like a good family, together, or if we squabble and get divided and get side-tracked, we'll be held back, like a not very good family, together. We are a part of America's greater national community. All of you have to be part of that mission. I am committed to doing everything I can to build a good partnership with you, to move our country forward.

We've come a good ways in the 25 years since Black Enterprise was born, but there is still a lot to be done. Too many people still don't have the chance to reach their God-given potential, and affirmative action is just one part of a larger strategy to expand opportunities for all Americans, in education and business and all our workplaces. That larger strategy has to begin with Head Start for poor children. It has to include lower costs and better, more available college loans for the children of working families as well as poor families. It has to include adequate job training for people when they lose their jobs or when they're underemployed. It has to include creating business opportunities where none existed before.

That's what our empowerment zones are for. That's what the community development financial institutions are for. That's what stronger enforcement of the Community Re-

investment Act is for. We have to invest in our cities and the people who live there. We have to invest in our rural areas and the people who live there. We have to invest in our workers and in our working families.

That's why I believe we need a real family values agenda, which includes raising the minimum wage, targeting tax relief to the raising of children and the educating of children, protecting Medicare for our seniors, and protecting the right of people to keep their own health insurance if they change jobs or someone in the family gets sick.

We can balance the budget, and we should. Progressives, minorities, Democrats those of us who care about public investment, we don't have a stake in a permanent Government deficit. That just gives more and more money every year to the people who hold the debt and less and less to the people who need the investment. But we have to balance this budget in a way that allows us to grow together, without gutting our responsibilities to our parents in health care, without gutting our responsibilities to our children in education, without undermining our responsibilities to maintain a social safety net and provide for a clean environment and a healthy and safe environment as well.

We have to follow the right kind of strategy to balance the budget, grow the economy, and help all Americans, together. Only when we work together can we restore economic opportunity, solve our social problems, compete and win in the global economy of the 21st century, only when we do it together.

We do not have a person to waste. That is the big decision that all of us have to face. Captains of industry, leaders in education, mentors to a new generation: that's what many of you are. You have a big role in this strategy for America's future. Every time you help a young person get an education, help someone get started in business, provide an example by being a successful person yourself who took on the challenge and responsibility of entrepreneurship and made it, every time you do one of those things you're making a difference and helping to move us forward.

I want you to think about what's at stake. Here in Washington, the old debate about what was liberal or conservative is really not

what's going on. You know, I have cut the deficit more, reduced the size of Government more, eliminated more governmental regulations and governmental programs than my two Republican predecessors. I've also invested more in education, expanded trade, tried to help poor areas and minority businesses, tried to empower families with things like family and medical leave and affordable college loans and national service, things that have traditionally been called liberal. I'm trying to move people from welfare to work but only if they can support their children and help them to grow up and be successful.

We've got to do things in a different way. But the debate we're having here is the most profound debate we've had in a hundred years. And every one of you has got to make up your mind to be a part of it because the old conservative things that I just mentioned, they're hardly on the radar screen here.

We're debating here with a new generation of so-called conservatives who, I think, have some radical ideas. They believe that, except for defense, any tax cut, any tax cut, is better than any Government program. They believe that some of the things we'd like to do through Government are nice enough but not worth imposing any, any, requirement or sacrifice or contribution on Americans who aren't going to directly benefit. They believe in a future that really would unleash us all from each other, minimize our responsibilities to each other, and run the risk of giving us a country with a whole lot of wealthy people but vastly more poor and a declining middle class.

I believe in a high-opportunity, high-growth future where we grow the middle class and shrink the under class, where we support entrepreneurs but we also believe that we have an obligation to help everybody make the most of their own lives. And to do it, we need strong neighborhoods with safe streets and good health care systems and good schools and clean environments. And we need a commitment to help people through education and through efforts to deal with our very difficult and thorny social problems.

In other words, I believe we really are a family. I think we have certain obligations to one another that we have a responsibility

to fulfill. And I don't believe any of us are going to be the kind of people we want to be, and I don't think our children will have the kind of future we want them to have, unless we make up our mind that there are some things we have to do together.

If you look at the 21st century, and you say, what's it going to be like—there will be a global economy, information will speed around the world quickly, goods will cross national borders, the world will get smaller—you have to say that the United States, because of the strength of our economic system and because we are the most diverse, big, rich country on Earth—racially, religiously, ethnically—that we're in better shape for the 21st century than any other great country, that our best days are still ahead of us. But we have to answer the debate now going on in Washington properly for that to be true.

We haven't had a debate like this since the industrial revolution changed America and Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson had to answer questions like, how are we going to keep a private economy but have real competition in things like oil and steel? They had to ask questions like, how are we going to let people work but stop these 9- and 10-year-old kids from working 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, in coal mines and factories? We reached the right kind of decisions then, and we preserved the free enterprise system and broadened freedom and opportunity throughout the 20th century steadily. We even survived the Great Depression and conquered the oppressors in World War II because of the power of our country.

Well, now we're moving into a dramatically different kind of economy. The way we work and live is changing dramatically. And we are literally having the debates again in Washington that we had a hundred years ago. You have got to be a part of that. You know that believing that we work together and grow together is not inconsistent with believing in enterprise and individual effort and personal responsibility and hard work. You know that.

That is the lesson America must emblazon in its heart and its mind if the 21st century is going to be our golden age. I think it will be because of people like Earl Graves, because of efforts like Black Enterprise, because of all the African-American entre-

preneurs who have made a difference in our Nation, knowing that whenever they succeed, they're helping us all to come closer together, closer to the dream of equal opportunity for all Americans, without which we will never, never have the progress we all want and need for our children in the next century.

Thank you, Earl. Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 9:10 p.m. from the Diplomatic Reception Room at the White House to the gala in New York City. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Jesse L. Jackson of the Rainbow Coalition; Mayor Kurt Schmoke of Baltimore, MD; former Governor of Virginia L. Douglas Wilder; Maynard Jackson, former mayor of Atlanta, GA; and David Dinkins, former mayor of New York City.

Remarks Prior to a Roundtable Discussion on Teenage Smoking

August 10, 1995

Well, good morning. Ladies and gentlemen, today I have brought together medical experts and children who have taken a pledge against smoking to talk about our common commitment to ending youth smoking.

This issue is critical to our efforts to improve the health of our Nation. According to the Center for Disease Control, of the 2 million Americans who will die in 1995, over 400,000 of them will have conditions related to smoking.

Later today I will announce my strategy for combating this problem based on one simple idea: We should do everything we possibly can to keep tobacco out of the hands of our young people in the United States.

Now I'd like to call on Shana Bailey, who is a 12-year-old from Florida who's part of a successful program that teaches students how and why they should stay smoke-free.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:18 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

The President's News Conference

August 10, 1995

Teenage Smoking

The President. Good afternoon. Today I am announcing broad executive action to protect the young people of the United States from the awful dangers of tobacco.

Over the years we have learned more and more about the dangers of addictive substances to our young people. In the sixties and seventies we came to realize the threat drugs posed to young Americans. In the eighties we came to grips with the awful problem of drunk driving among young people. It is time to take a third step to free our teenagers from addiction and dependency.

Adults are capable of making their own decisions about whether to smoke. But we all know that children are especially susceptible to the deadly temptation of tobacco and its skillful marketing. Today and every day this year, 3,000 young people will begin to smoke. One thousand of them ultimately will die of cancer, emphysema, heart disease, and other diseases caused by smoking. That's more than a million vulnerable young people a year being hooked on nicotine that ultimately could kill them.

Therefore, by executive authority, I will restrict sharply the advertising, promotion, distribution, and marketing of cigarettes to teenagers. I do this on the basis of the best available scientific evidence, the findings of the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Centers for Disease Control. Fourteen months of study by the Food and Drug Administration confirms what we all know: Cigarettes and smokeless tobacco are harmful, highly addictive, and aggressively marketed to our young people. The evidence is overwhelming, and the threat is immediate.

Our children face a health crisis that is getting worse. One-third more 8th-graders and one-quarter more 10th-graders are smoking today than 4 years ago. One out of five high school seniors is a daily smoker. We need to act, and we must act now, before another generation of Americans is condemned to

fight a difficult and grueling personal battle with an addiction that will cost millions of them their lives.

Adults make their own decisions about whether or not to smoke. Relatively few people start to smoke past their teens. Many adults have quit; many have tried and failed. But we all know that teenagers are especially susceptible to pressures, pressure to the manipulation of mass media advertising, the pressure of the seduction of skilled marketing campaigns aimed at exploiting their insecurities and uncertainties about life.

When Joe Camel tells young children that smoking is cool, when billboards tell teens that smoking will lead to true romance, when Virginia Slims tells adolescents that cigarettes may make them thin and glamorous, then our children need our wisdom, our guidance, and our experience. We are their parents, and it is up to us to protect them.

So today I am authorizing the Food and Drug Administration to initiate a broad series of steps all designed to stop sales and marketing of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to children. As a result, the following steps will be taken. First, young people will have to prove their age with an I.D. card to buy cigarettes. Second, cigarette vending machines which circumvent any ban on sales to kids will be prohibited. Third, schools and playgrounds will be free of tobacco advertising on billboards in their neighborhoods. Fourth, images such as Joe Camel will not appear on billboards or in ads in publications that reach substantial numbers of children and teens. Fifth, teens won't be targeted by any marketing gimmicks, ranging from single cigarette sales to T-shirts, gym bags, and sponsorship of sporting events. And finally, the tobacco industry must fund and implement an annual \$150 million campaign aimed at stopping teens from smoking through educational efforts.

Now, these are all commonsense steps. They don't ban smoking; they don't bar advertising. We do not, in other words, seek to address activities that seek to sell cigarettes only to adults. We are stepping in to protect those who need our help, our vulnerable young people. And the evidence of increasing smoking in the last few years is plain and compelling.

Now, nobody much likes Government regulation. And I would prefer it if we could have done this in some other way. The only other way I can think of is if Congress were to write these restrictions into law. They could do that. And if they do, this rule could become unnecessary. But it is wrong to believe that we can take a voluntary approach to this problem. And absent congressional action, and in the presence of a massive marketing and lobbying campaign by cigarette companies aimed at our children, clearly, I have no alternative but to do everything I can to bring this assault to a halt.

The issue has touched all of us in personal ways. We all know friends or family members whose lives were shortened because of their involvement with tobacco. The Vice President's sister, a heavy smoker who started as a teen, died of lung cancer. It is that kind of pain that I seek to spare other families and young children. Less smoking means less cancer, less illness, longer lives, a stronger America. Acting together we can make a difference. With this concerted plan targeted at those practices that especially prey upon our children, we can save lives, and we will.

To those who produce and market cigarettes, I say today, take responsibility for your actions. Sell your products only to adults. Draw the line on children. Show by your deeds as well as your words that you recognize that it is wrong as well as illegal to hook one million children a year on tobacco.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Q. Mr. President, with your decision on tobacco you're taking on one of the biggest cash crops in a region where you've already got major political problems. Are you writing off the South for next year's elections? And isn't this a blow to other Democratic candidates in tobacco States?

The President. Well, first of all, the most important thing is that there is an epidemic among our children. You've got a third more 8th-graders, a quarter more 10th-graders smoking than there were 10 years ago. Whatever the political consequences, a thousand kids a day are beginning a habit which will probably shorten their lives. I mean, that is the issue. And I believe that is the issue everywhere.

I believe there are tobacco farmers in the States which grow tobacco, who have been involved in it a hundred years or more—their families—who don't want their kids to start smoking. We're not talking about whether they have a right to grow tobacco or reap the paltry 4½ cents, which is all they get out of a pack of cigarettes. We're talking about whether we are going to do what we know is the right thing to do to save the lives of America's children. And I think it is more important than any political consequence.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, the war in Bosnia is widening. How long is the world, particularly the Europeans who have been there in the past, how long are they going to stand—we all are going to stand by and watch this barbarism on both sides? And what are your new initiatives to end this suffering?

The President. Well, first of all, let me briefly review what our objectives are. Our objectives are to minimize suffering, to stop the war from spreading, to preserve the integrity of a Bosnian state. We have promoted the Muslim-Croat Federation. We have plainly succeeded in limiting the war. And except when the United Nations and NATO had not done what they said they would do, we have saved lives.

This is an important moment in Bosnia, and it could be a moment of real promise. Because of the military actions of the last few days, the situation on the ground has changed. There is some uncertainty and instability. It could go either way. But I think it's a time when we should try to make a move to make peace.

Now, since the fall of Srebrenica and Zepa, we have tried to do two things: first of all, to strengthen the presence of the United Nations through the Rapid Reaction Force of the French, the British, and the Dutch, which we are supporting; and through getting a clearer chain of command and a stronger, broader use of authority for NATO to have air power where necessary where the protected areas are threatened.

The second thing we want to do is to see whether or not some diplomatic solution can

be brought to bear that would be fair and decent and just and that would take advantage of this moment where people are reassessing their various positions. And that's what Mr. Lake is doing in Europe. We are consulting with all of our allies, and we're going to do the very best we can. I think we need to try to make a decent and good peace here because, ultimately, that's the answer to all the questions you ask.

Q. [*Inaudible*]*—*you have new ideas?

The President. Well, we're exploring some ideas with the Europeans. I will say again what I said from the first day I came here: I do not believe it is right to impose peace on people. I don't think in the end you get a lasting peace. So the United States does not seek to impose peace. But we're exploring some different ideas. We don't have a set map; we don't have a set position. We have some ideas that the new events may make possible, and we're discussing it with our allies.

Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, in view of the powerful evidence of the dangers of smoking which you cited, wouldn't it have been more logical to impose an outright ban instead of a regulatory partial step which has the effect of getting the Federal Government into the business of regulating the size of print in advertising?

The President. Well, first I don't know that the Federal Government will regulate the size of print; we regulate the warning labels. And of course, there is a proposal here on advertising to try to deal with restricting access to billboard advertising and others.

But I think it would be wrong to ban cigarettes outright because, number one, it's not illegal for adults to use them. Tens of millions of adults do use them, and I think it would be as ineffective as prohibition was. But I think to focus on our children is the right thing to do. Purchasing of cigarettes by young people, children, is supposed to be illegal in all 50 States, but they do it regularly. These fine young people here were with me this morning, and one of them talked about how he bought cigarette pack after cigarette pack after cigarette pack out of vending machines

to try to demonstrate to his local legislators that the laws were a sham. These will not make the laws a sham. This will enable us to save young people's lives.

China

Q. Mr. President, has there been any progress in getting China to free human rights activist, Harry Wu? And related to that, will Mrs. Clinton be going to China in September to attend the U.N. Conference on Women?

The President. On the first question, we're obviously very concerned about Harry Wu and following his case very closely. And I think the situation is in a position where the less that is said about it right now, the better. But it's a very important issue to the United States, and I think to people throughout the world.

No decision has yet been made about whether the First Lady will go to China. But I think it's important for the American people to understand that this conference on women is a United Nations-sponsored conference that they decided to hold in China. It is a very important thing in its own right, and the United States will be represented there with a very strong delegation, whether she goes or not. And I think it's important that we be represented there.

Yes, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, the situation in Iraq seems to be somewhat fluid right now with the defection of two of Saddam Hussein's daughters, two of his sons-in-law, his oldest grandchild to Jordan. And King Hussein's granting political asylum to all of these people. First of all, can you assess what is happening in Baghdad right now? And have you offered additional assurances to Jordan that the United States will provide security if there is a threat from Iraq?

The President. Well, as soon as the defections occurred, King Hussein contacted us, and I called him back as quickly as I could on Tuesday evening, and we had a long talk about it. I think what these defections demonstrate is just how difficult things are within Iraq now and how out of touch Saddam Hussein has become with reality, how difficult

things are for his people. I also think this evidence supports the strong and firm position the United States has taken of not lifting the sanctions until Iraq fully complies with all the United Nations resolutions. I think that is—it's clear that we have done the right thing.

Now, with regard to your second question, King Hussein's decision, located where he is, to grant asylum to those individuals was clearly an act of real courage. And I have assured him and told him that we would stand behind Jordan. We owe it to the people who are our partners in peace in the Middle East to stand behind them, and we have already made it clear that if Iraq threatens its neighbors or violates United Nations resolutions, we would take appropriate action. I think we have to do so in this case.

Q. Any contingency steps being taken?

The President. Well, I think you saw when Kuwait was threatened a few months ago, we are quite well-organized, and we have thought through what our—various scenarios there and how we might move. But beyond that, I don't want to say. And I don't want to raise a red flag. I'm just saying we know that Saddam Hussein has been unpredictable in the past, we know this must be a very unsettling development, and it should be clear that the United States considers Jordan our ally and entitled to our protection if there security is threatened as a result of this incident.

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, given the fact that there's been a 20-year war against drugs, which are illegal for everybody, which has produced, at best, mixed results, and given the fact that anybody who has kids know that the more you prohibit something, the more attractive it often becomes, what makes you think that you think you can do any better in the war against cigarettes than we've done against drugs?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that—let me take on your premise here. There have been sustained periods of years in our country and in recent history when drug use has gone down in all categories of drugs, among all ages of people without regard to race or income. Unfortunately, today

the picture is somewhat mixed because casual drug use among young people seems to be going up in areas where they feel a certain level of hopelessness. And we intend to reassert our efforts there.

But it's simply not true that cultural changes and legal bars together cannot work to reduce consumption. With regard to cigarettes, we have seen cultural changes leading to reduction in consumption. But what we see among young people is adults quitting and young people increasing their usage. If you make it clearly illegal, more inaccessible, you reduce the lure of advertising and then you have an affirmative campaign, a positive campaign, so that you don't just say no, you give young people information and make it the smart, the cool, the hip thing to do to take care of yourself and keep yourself healthy and alive. I believe there is every evidence from what has happened in drugs and in many other areas that we will see a dramatic decline in smoking among young people. I think we can do that.

And I think you see—there have been a lot of cultural changes to that effect in other areas. You see some States that have done it right have big increase in the use of seat-belts. Drunk driving goes down dramatically in some areas with the combination of the right sort of enforcement and the right sort of publicity. So I believe—I just don't accept your premise. I think we'll have a big dent in this problem.

Appropriations Legislation

Q. Mr. President, the House has cut \$20 billion in discretionary spending for next year. Will they have to return some of those cuts to avoid you vetoing some of their appropriations bills?

The President. Yes. [Laughter]

Whitewater Hearings

Q. Mr. President, on Whitewater, you've said in the past that as far as you know everything as far as major evidence that is going to come out is out. We now face the prospect though of hearings going into 1996. Do you view this as pure politics? Do you worry about the overall shadow it has cast, merely the appearance of wrongdoing over the White House?

The President. I don't have anything new to add to what I've already said about that. I will reiterate, when I started this whole episode I said I would cooperate fully; I have cooperated fully. There is nothing else for me to do. I have to spend my energies and time being President, and that's what I'm doing my best to do.

Yes, Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Political Reform and Ross Perot

Q. Mr. President, what message do you want Senator Dodd and Mr. McLarty to take to Ross Perot when they go down there this weekend? And also, do you feel that Ross Perot's contribution to the issue of political reform is significant enough that you would consider appointing him to the bipartisan commission should it get established?

The President. The answer to the second question—let me answer that first—the answer to the second question is, yes, I would consider doing that, but first, the Speaker has got to answer my letter or see John Gardner or Doris Kearns Goodwin or do something to respond to the handshake we made in New Hampshire. Of all the strange things that happen in Washington—and I know people think that all the rules are different here than they are for anybody anywhere else in America—but even here, when you shake hands with somebody in broad daylight and say you're going to do something, you ought to at least act like your going to do it. [Laughter] Where I come from, you know, if kids did that, their mamas wouldn't let them have dinner before—they got spanked, when I was growing up I mean, this is an amazing thing. So, yes, I would.

The second part of the question was what will their message be. Their message will be: Number one, that the things that Ross Perot and Bill Clinton advocated in '92 had a lot of overlap, and we have made significant progress in implementing 80 percent of the things that Ross Perot campaigned for in 1992; two, a lot of the things that we haven't done are because of obstruction in Congress and I mention only two, the line-item veto and political reform; and third, our budget is more consistent with the budget priorities outlined by Ross Perot and his campaign in

1992, that is, balance the budget but increase investment in education, research, and development, technology, and defense conversion.

So, we've got a record message. We've got a present conflict message. We've got a message to ask them to come help us to support meaningful political reform and the right kind of balanced budget.

Tobacco Industry

Q. Mr. President, you noted in your speech in Charlotte yesterday that children follow what we do more than what we say. And I wonder what you think the message is when, on the one hand, the Government cracks down on teen smoking, on the other hand, it spends perhaps \$25 million a year subsidizing the growth of tobacco, and when you yourself continue to smoke those big old cigars. [Laughter]

The President. Well first of all, as you know, I'm allergic to cigars, so I don't smoke many anymore. But I smoke a handful a year probably, and I probably shouldn't. And I try not to do it in any way that sets a bad example. But I plead guilty to that.

On the tobacco program, if it is self-financing—and I have always supported the tobacco program. It is essentially a self financing program. The question is, do you want this tobacco grown by family farmers, or do you want it grown by big corporations if it's a self-financing program? I would not favor a large taxpayer outlay for it. But a self-financing program, essentially which is what that is, has been designed to preserve the structure of family farms and the culture of the family farms rather than let the big tobacco companies grow it themselves and turn all those folks into hired hands. I have thought, since it was going to be grown one way or the other, the family farm structure was a better one. I don't think that sends a signal that we think young people ought to smoke cigarettes.

Drug Cartels

Q. [Inaudible]—the Colombian Government has captured some of the top leaders of both cartels and there's been friction between your government and the Samper government when he came in. My first question is, do you think they are doing everything

they can? And the second question is, how worried are you that as the Colombian cartel wanes in influence, Mexican cartels will pick up the breach?

The President. Well, first of all, I want to support the statements made by the DEA Director in my administration, Tom Considine. We have worked very hard with the Colombians and with others in South America, and you see the results in the last several months. We have had more major drug dealers arrested than in any previous similar time in our history, I believe. And we're on the verge of breaking this Cali cartel. It's been great cooperation; we've worked hard. It's making a difference.

Secondly, as long as the raw crops can be grown and processed and distributed, we will have a constant battle, as long as there's demand in the United States, to keep any vacuum from being filled. And we are exploring today what the problems created by our successes might be, that is, if we continue to break down existing cartels, who will take up the slack and how can we prevent it.

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, last week you said that you did not want to advance a tobacco strategy that would get caught up in the courts and prevent any kind of action from taking place for years. Now you seem to have embarked on that strategy. Tobacco companies have already today filed suit against your proposals. Why did you determine a voluntary effort in concert with the tobacco companies would not work? And is there any hope for some sort of compromise, some sort of either compromise with the tobacco companies or congressional action before you implement these regulations?

The President. Well, first of all, I had hoped that the tobacco companies would agree to support these restrictions and to put them in law. And it's still not too late for that. The FDA—Dr. Kessler has announced today a rulemaking procedure on the assumption of jurisdiction and on the specifics that I just outlined. If the tobacco companies accept those and this Congress will write them into law, then you will not have a long regulatory proceeding. But you will have immediate, immediate, effects. That is, if they

would rather have a law than Federal regulation, the FDA Director, Dr. Kessler, and I would rather have an immediate impact on teen smoking, not 2 years of litigation and then start the work. So it is not too late for that.

But I am against a voluntary plan. I'm against it for several reasons. First of all, there would be no way to enforce it. Secondly, the history of voluntary agreements with the tobacco industry is not good, to put it mildly. And thirdly, even if they tried to adhere to it, I don't believe they could legally do so.

Let me just give you one example. Suppose you were in the vending machine business and you sued the tobacco companies for deciding together that they were going to not let your vending machines go anywhere. Without a legal requirement there's a good chance that could be held in a court of law to be a restraint of trade. So I think even if they tried to do it, they couldn't do it.

So we have to have a mandatory system. But I would just as soon have an act of Congress. Doctor Kessler agrees because we've got an epidemic of teen smoking, and far better to start right now as soon as we can pass a law than wait until we wade through all this litigation.

Airline Safety

Q. Mr. President, there was a scary breakdown yesterday in the air traffic control system in the western United States, and we've had similar incidents in past months and recent years. Can you tell the American people that the FAA is doing everything possible to preserve the safety of the flying public, or do you see that new measures need to be taken?

The President. I can tell you that I have asked that question repeatedly since I have been President, and I have worked very hard on making sure that we are moving to do everything we can constantly to make sure that the air traffic control system is as safe as possible.

We also, as you know, have ordered some new measures to be taken to promote airline security, which the Secretary of Transportation announced just in the last couple of days. And I do want to emphasize to the

American people because I know there's been a lot of discussion about it, there was no specific incident that prompted me to make the decision to try to increase security around airports. But the overall conditions, it seemed to me, dictated that we do that.

And I think that this country has been very strong against terrorism through military action, imposing sanctions, stopping sanctions from being lifted, stopping terrorist incidents before they occur, arresting terrorists shortly after they commit acts. This is a part of our ongoing effort to protect the American people from that.

And parenthetically, I would like to say I certainly wish the Congress would pass the antiterrorism legislation which was promised to me on Memorial Day. That would also help us in this regard.

Teenage Drinking

Q. In going after teenage smoking, Mr. President, did you consider including alcohol abuse as part of that? I know you mentioned drunk driving in your opening remarks, but alcohol among young people is thought to be as much of a problem as smoking is.

The President. First of all, it is far less accessible. It's harder to get. What we have advocated there, and I hope the Congress will adopt, is a national zero tolerance for alcohol among young drivers. If we go to zero tolerance among young drivers, I think it will make a difference. Now, I noted last week and I would like to give the State credit for it; one State adopted zero tolerance this last week. We are now up to 27 States that have done it on their own. But I think zero tolerance is the best thing to do.

Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News].

Opposition From Congress

Q. Mr. President, there's a move on Capitol Hill among some right-wing Senators—Faircloth of North Carolina—and also joined by—and D'Amato, of course, New York—and several left-wing Democrats, real liberal left-wing Democrats to try to get you out of office this month. They're going to try to do that by embarrassing you so that you will resign. Would you resign your office under any circumstances? [Laughter]

The President. Well, if you promise to run off with me, I might. [Laughter] But otherwise I can't think of any reason. [Laughter]

1996 Election

Q. Mr. President, continuing on the political mien, if we might. [Laughter] A year from now the Republican Presidential convention opens. Looking at the electoral vote now, it seems to be a lot of political experts say that you're in trouble in the South, in trouble in the West, it's really going to be an uphill battle for reelection. How do you assess your position at this time?

The President. Well, first of all, I don't think my position at this time amounts to anything because the world will turn around. At this time, when I started running for President—I hadn't even declared for President this time 4 years ago, and everybody said the incumbent President could not be defeated. So I don't think anyone knows, and I think all this is idle speculation.

I will tell you this: I have done my best to do what I said I would do when I ran. This is the second anniversary of our economic plan. We passed our reconciliation bill on this day 2 years ago. Theirs is still not passed. And the people who are now in charge of the Congress said that it would be the end of the world; we would have a terrible recession; it would bankrupt the country; it would be awful. And 2 years later, we have 7 million jobs, 2½ million new homeowners, 1½ million new small businesses, a record, a record number of new self-made millionaires, a very high stock market, very low inflation.

Now, this is the first time in history we've had this kind of surge that hasn't also raised the incomes of ordinary people because of the new realities which we face. So now, economic policy must be seen as a two-step, not a one-step, process. We've got to grow the economy and raise incomes. That's why I want to raise the minimum wage. That's why I want to give every unemployed worker or under-employed worker the right to 2 years of education at the local community college. That's why I'm trying to have a tax cut that's focused on child rearing and education, to raise incomes.

But I believe when the record of this administration is made, in every area, whether it's this or in fighting crime or protecting the environment or educating our people or trying to prepare the world for the end of the post-cold-war era and a new era of cooperation, I believe the American people will listen, and then they'll make their own judgments about it. But I don't think anybody can know what's going to happen a year and a half from now.

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, are you sure you wouldn't like to pledge today not to smoke cigars anymore to set an example? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, you mean should I go from five or six down to zero a year? Maybe so. But I don't think that's the point. The point I want to make is, number one, cigars and pipes were not found by the FDA to be part of this. Did you know that?

Number two, the issue is, for me—I try to set a good example. I try never to do it when people see. I admitted that I did do it when Captain O'Grady was found because I was so happy. It was a form of celebration. But I don't think you should let that become the issue. The issue is whether the children are smoking cigarettes in this country.

Nuclear Testing by France

Q. Mr. President, on the French nuclear testing, the French are now saying they will agree to a zero threshold for nuclear tests in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Will the U.S. concur? Do you think the French should cancel their tests? And very importantly, has the U.S. agreed to share technology with the French so that they can develop their own computer simulations and not have to test?

The President. I applaud the French statement today. It will make it much easier for us to get a comprehensive test ban. I do not think they should resume testing, but they know that. That's a difference between us and them and most of the rest of the world and them. And we will have a statement about our own policy in the very near future, but I don't want to make it today.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Let's make this one the last question.

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, the steps that you outlined today are tailored very carefully to curb the sale of tobacco to young people. My question is, if they're implemented, will the FDA retain power that would allow them at a future date to ban or curb sale of tobacco to adults?

The President. Well, of course, that's what the tobacco companies are worried about, I guess. Our belief is that this is a pediatric disease. This is a problem for children, that when tobacco is lawful, it would be wrong for a Government agency to try to in any way restrict the access of adults to it if it is lawful. So the answer is, I don't know what the law would be because, in this case, I'm not the lawyer for the agency. I can't give you a lawful answer. I can tell you that the policy of this Government is that the focus should be on our children, their health and their welfare. That is the focus.

If there is a worry underlying the question you asked, there is an answer to that worry: Put it in the law. Let's have the tobacco companies come in. Let's talk to the Members of Congress from the tobacco-growing States. Let's pass it into law. Pass these restrictions. Put them into law. Do it now. Then we won't have all these lawsuits, and we will begin immediately, right now, to protect the children of this country. That is the answer.

Yes, Deborah [Deborah Mathis, Gannett News Service].

Whitewater Hearings

Q. Mr. President, there has been a parade of you and your wife's friends, associates, aides, former aides on Capitol Hill lately in both the Senate and House Whitewater hearings. How does it make you feel to see so many of your old friends and associates being grilled, in effect? And have you been keeping track of the hearings, and if so, how?

The President. The answer to the second question is, not really. Occasionally I see a clip or something, but I don't watch television very much, except late at night for a few minutes before I go to bed. So I haven't had a chance to keep up with it. My impression is that they have all acquitted themselves quite well, and I've been proud of them. But

I don't have anything to say on the underlying substance beyond what I've already said.

Teenage Smoking

Q. Mr. President, on the FDA rule again, a coalition of advertisers is filing suit today saying that for a legal product, your rule would go far beyond any precedent in restricting first amendment rights. Is there any precedent that you could cite that would be equivalent in its reach into the first amendment? And if not, are you not concerned about that aspect?

The President. First of all, nobody who's ever held this office loved the first amendment any more than I do. And no one has ever felt both edges of it any more than I have. I believe in the first amendment. That's what my speech about religious freedom was about the other day. I believe in it.

But I would remind you of just a few basic facts. It is illegal for children to smoke cigarettes. How then can it be legal for people to advertise to children to get them to smoke cigarettes? And does anybody seriously doubt that a lot of this advertisement is designed to reach children so we get new customers for the tobacco companies as the old customers disappear? It cannot be a violation of the freedom of speech in this country to say that you cannot advertise to entice people to do something which they cannot legally do. So I just don't buy the first amendment argument, it's just not true.

And by the way, that is why—to go back to an earlier question—the FDA ran the risk of having a rather complex rule to make it clear that there should be some freedom left, some considerable freedom left to advertise to adults.

Yes, ma'am.

China

Q. Mr. President, your administration has said on many occasions that you're going to adhere to the one-China policy. However, the two sides of Taiwan's fate obviously have different views on what this one China is. And you are the one who made the decision to allow President Teng-hui to come to the United States, and China is very, very unhappy now. So I wonder, how are you going to balance between a democratic Taiwan

willing to risk everything to seek international recognition and, on the other hand, the very, very important strategic interests between the United States and China?

The President. First of all, we're going to balance them by continuing to adhere to the one-China policy. It is the policy of the United States; it has been for years; it continues to be.

Secondly, we are going to do everything we can to make sure that our policy is clearly understood in China and in Taiwan. I made the decision personally to permit President Li from Taiwan to come into this country not as the head of state, not as the head of a government that we had recognized but because he wanted to come. I'm sure there were political aspects to this, but he asked whether he could come to his college reunion, whether he could give speeches, whether he could travel in our United States. He is a law-abiding person. We had no grounds on which to deny him.

In the American culture there is a constitutional right to travel and a constitutional right to speak. And as a man who has almost never missed any of his high school or college reunions, I just felt I ought to give him the same opportunity. It was not an abrogation of our one-China policy in any way. It was a recognition of something that's special in our culture about the rights we accord individuals who obey our laws and comport themselves appropriately.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, as you know, the welfare reform bill has been delayed in the Senate. I wonder how optimistic you are that welfare reform can pass this year and to what extent welfare reform has been wrapped up in Republican Presidential politics.

The President. Well, it plainly has been wrapped up to some extent in Republican Presidential politics, and that's bad because 85 percent of the American people want it. As I think Senator Dole acknowledged a day or so ago, I made a personal appeal to him to try to work with me to get a welfare reform bill out and to do it this year.

What do we want out of welfare reform? We want work. We want time limits. We want responsible parenting. Those are the

three things we want. Can we get there from where we are? I think we can. I think that Senator Dole has moved somewhat away from the extreme right of his party. Senator Daschle, Senator Mikulski, and Senator Breaux have offered a bill which has united the Democrats in moving away from the conventional wisdom toward welfare reform. And what we need to do over this break is that folks need to get together and figure out how we can put these approaches together and come out with a bill which promotes work, which promotes time limits, which promotes responsible parenting. I cannot believe we can't reach an agreement here.

Meanwhile, I will keep trying to get more States involved. You know, I have 32 States now that I've given permission to get out from under the Federal rules to promote welfare reform. And I would remind you I have offered all 50 States within 30 days the right to require young teen mothers to stay at home and stay in school to get checks, to put time limits and work requirements on welfare reform, and to allow the States to convert the welfare benefits and the food stamp benefits into wage supplements to get private employers to hire people in the private sector. Every State in the country could do that within the next 30 days. They just call us and send a request; we do it.

So we'll keep working, but we need the legislation, especially because we have to have national standards for tough child support enforcement that we cannot implement without the law.

I think our time is—one more question. Yes, go ahead.

Legislative Priorities

Q. Before the tobacco regulations came up this news conference was billed as your chance to give a farewell message to Congress. If you could send them a postcard from Jackson next week—[laughter]—what would you list as your top three or four priorities?

The President. We need to pass a decent budget that balances the budget but doesn't do it on the backs of elderly people who don't have enough to live on by exploding their Medicare costs; it doesn't walk away from our commitment to education, the education of our young people from Head Start to more

affordable college loans through national service; that doesn't undermine our common commitment to the environment. We can find common ground on this budget that brings the American people together and moves us forward.

The second thing I would say is, we need to pass welfare reform. We need to pass welfare reform—work, time limits, responsible parenting.

The third thing I would say is, let's get to work on the unfinished agenda here, pass the antiterrorism bill, the line-item veto, appoint the political reform commission. Let's get after it. Let's do the things that we all are for, we keep saying we're for. Let's deliver for the American people.

Let me say in closing that my family and I are leaving on Tuesday for Wyoming, and I want you to enjoy your vacation.

Thank you, and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 101st news conference began at 1:32 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Memorandum on Mobile Services Antennas

August 10, 1995

Memorandum for the Heads of Departments and Agencies

Subject: Facilitating Access to Federal Property for the Siting of Mobile Services Antennas

Recent advancements in mobile telecommunications technology present an opportunity for the rapid construction of the Nation's wireless communications infrastructure. As a matter of policy, the Federal Government shall encourage the efficient and timely implementation of such new technologies and the concomitant infrastructure buildout as a means of stimulating economic growth and creating new jobs. The recent auctioning and impending licensing of radio frequencies for mobile personal communications services presents the Federal Government with the opportunity to foster new technologies and to encourage the development of communications infrastructure by

making Federal property available for the siting of mobile services antennas.

Therefore, to the extent permitted by law, I hereby direct the Administrator of General Services, within 90 days, in consultation with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Defense, and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator may determine, to develop procedures necessary to facilitate appropriate access to Federal property for the siting of mobile services antennas.

The procedures should be developed in accordance with the following:

1. (a) Upon request, and to the extent permitted by law and where practicable, executive departments and agencies shall make available Federal Government buildings and lands for the siting of mobile service antennas. This should be done in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, and consistent with national security concerns (including minimizing mutual electromagnetic interactions), public health and safety concerns, environmental and aesthetic concerns, preservation of historic buildings and monuments, protection of natural and cultural resources, protection of national park and wilderness values, protection of National Wildlife Refuge systems, and subject to any Federal requirements promulgated by the agency managing the facility and the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and other relevant departments and agencies.

(b) Antennas on Federal buildings or land may not contain any advertising.

(c) Federal property does not include lands held by the United States in trust for individual or Native American tribal governments.

(d) Agencies shall retain discretion to reject inappropriate siting requests, and assure adequate protection of public property and timely removal of equipment and structures at the end of service.

2. All procedures and mechanisms adopted regarding access to Federal property shall be clear and simple so as to facilitate the efficient and rapid buildout of the national wireless communications infrastructure.

3. Unless otherwise prohibited by or inconsistent with Federal law, agencies shall charge fees based on market value for siting antennas on Federal property, and may use competitive procedures if not all applicants can be accommodated.

This memorandum does not give the siting of mobile services antennas priority over other authorized uses of Federal buildings or land.

All independent regulatory commissions and agencies are requested to comply with the provisions of this memorandum.

This memorandum is not intended to create any right, benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers, or any other person.

This memorandum shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:15 p.m., August 10, 1995]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on August 14.

Memorandum on Emerging Democracies

August 10, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95-35

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State;
the Secretary of Agriculture*

Subject: Presidential Determination Under Section 1542(f) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, as Amended—Emerging Democracies

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 1542(f) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5622 note) (hereinafter “the Act”), I hereby determine that the following countries are taking the steps set forth in section 1542(f) of the Act to qualify as emerging democracies for purposes of that section:

Albania, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia,

Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

In making this determination, I have considered the eligibility only of those countries for which programs are underway or currently contemplated by the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 11.

Interview With Tabitha Soren of MTV

August 11, 1995

Teenage Smoking

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, minors buy one billion packs of cigarettes a year. How are you going to make not smoking and quitting smoking cool and attractive to young people?

The President. Well, I think we have to do several things. I think, first of all, the Government's responsibility is to make sure that the young people understand that it's addictive and dangerous and can kill them and that about one-third of the young people who start smoking every day—about 1,000 people a day, young people, start smoking who will have their lives shortened because of it. The second thing I think you have to do is make it less accessible. Then the third thing we have to do is make it less attractive, that is, we need to change the advertising and limit the ability of advertising to be a lure.

We had a young teenager in here who was part of an antismoking group yesterday who said to me—I was so touched—she said, “We look at these TV ads,” she said, “these girls smoking, they’re always tall; they’re always thin; they always have long hair; they’re al-

ways pretty.” She said, “It’s just like when the boys who are young see a movie star holding a gun.” And it was shocking what she said.

And then what we want the tobacco companies to do is to spend some money on an affirmative strategy to put out positive messages—over MTV, for example—about how it’s cool not to smoke instead of to smoke. So I think you make it less accessible, less attractive, and then put out a positive message. And of course, we need a lot of help. We need people like you to do programs like this, and every parent in this country needs to talk to their children—all the parents need to talk to their children about it, because we now have done 14 months careful research and we know how damaging this is, and we know that the tobacco companies know how damaging it is from their own files. We’ve got to do something about it.

Ms. Soren. Do you worry about making smoking more enticing by making it more forbidden to young people?

The President. I think that’s always a concern; there could be some of that. But the staggering magnitude of the damage that it’s doing is so great, I think if young people really understand how dangerous it really is and all the things that can happen to them and how it can affect their future, I don’t think it will be more glamorous.

Ms. Soren. You know, though, what kids are going to say. In a time where they’re growing up and sex is associated with AIDS, alcohol with drunk driving, going out late at night you could be shot, it’s very violent, smoking during your adolescence almost seems like a lesser evil.

The President. I know it does, but in some ways it’s the thing that puts the most at risk over the long run. And we have to do something about the other things, too. I’ve fought very hard to get the assault weapons out of the hands of gang members, to pass the Brady bill, to put more police officers on the street. The crime rate is going down in almost every—almost every big city in this country, the crime rate is going down. We have to—we’re doing a better job trying to keep big shipments of drugs out of the country. We’re working hard on that.

But this is a serious problem. On alcohol, it's less accessible than cigarettes. It's still a problem, but I want a zero tolerance drunk driving law for young people in every State in the country or here in the Congress. But the cigarettes—the magnitude of the damage caused is greater than all of that right now. And we just have to focus on it.

I know it—because there normally is a period of several years between the time you start and keep smoking and the time you face the consequences, and when you're young you think you're going to live forever, I know that it's going to be harder to get young people to focus on that. But we have to. There's a lot of destructive behavior in America we need to attack at the same time, and I just think that we can get these numbers way, way down.

You gave the number—a billion packs of cigarettes or a billion cigarettes a year—we can get that way down. And when we do, we'll get the life expectancy of these young people and their quality of life way up.

Ms. Soren. Did you ever experiment with cigarettes as a teen? Did you go through that phase?

The President. I didn't. But I'm surprised I didn't, but I didn't. The reason I didn't is because my mother was a heavy smoker. She smoked a couple of packs of cigarettes a day until my daughter got her to quit for her 8th birthday. When my daughter turned 8, her grandmother gave her that for a present. So I had a bad feeling about it from childhood. But it was only because of that. I'm sure I would have done it otherwise.

Ms. Soren. Why were you savvy enough to have a bad feeling about it? You didn't like the smell of the house, or you didn't like—

The President. Yes, I didn't like the smell in the house. And I thought it was—it struck me as a bad habit, kind of a nervous habit, a reliance. And I had a feeling that it was not good for her health.

Ms. Soren. What would you say to Chelsea if you saw her fall under peer pressure of some of her friends and start smoking or if you found ashes in her bedroom in an ashtray or something?

The President. I would talk to her about it and tell her I thought it was a bad idea.

She's the most militant person in our house, though.

Ms. Soren. Yes, it doesn't sound like you're worried.

The President. She and Hillary are always on me. You know, as I confessed yesterday, I still, once in a great while, maybe five, six, seven times a year, will smoke a cigar when I'm outside. They think that's awful—at all. And I've got to do better with it. But if they see me chewing one on the golf course or something, they're on me. So my family is doing a better job with it than I am.

Ms. Soren. Some kids I talk to said that nothing but an outright ban on cigarettes would deter them. So why not a ban? Because cigarettes are just as deadly, if not more so, for adults.

The President. They are, but they're not illegal. You have to go through all the same problems we went through with prohibition with liquor. It would have significant economic dislocations for a large number of Americans. And I think as a practical matter, because so many adults are, in effect, hooked on it, it would be very, very difficult to enforce.

What I want to do is to phase it out over time by getting—if young people stop using cigarettes—if we could get young people, the usage down to zero, then eventually it will phase out. That would be my goal. I think we just have to start with our young people.

Ms. Soren. Do you consider tobacco companies evil?

The President. I wouldn't go that far. I don't think that. And I certainly don't consider the tobacco farmers evil. I think they're good people. Most of them—a lot of them come from families that have been doing it 100, sometimes 200 years.

I think some of these companies have known for a long time, according to their own documents, that nicotine was both addictive and destructive. And they have—insofar as they have pretended that they did not know that, that is wrong.

I think some of these companies have said, we don't want teenagers to smoke, but they have consciously directed their advertising strategies to make it appealing to young people and not just Joe Camel, which was obvi-

ous, but a lot of other things as well. I think those things are wrong.

And what I want the tobacco companies to do is stop doing the wrong thing and start doing the right thing. I think they ought to come in here and support this—these restrictions. I think they ought to ask Congress to enact them into law now. If they don't want the FDA to regulate them, let's enact the law now. And I think that we ought to start the very next day on this campaign together. If the tobacco companies really don't want kids to smoke, we can do this together.

Ms. Soren. Are you going to try to bring back the cigarette tax? California has had a lot of success with that in their State.

The President. Well, this Congress would not adopt that. I have had a number of people who've come from tobacco countries suggest that some of the cigarette tax ought to be devoted to helping the farmers who want to convert their farmland to other purposes, to some sort of buy-out program.

But I think that right now what we ought to do is—the bulk of the cigarette tax is available to the States, and a lot of the States now are passing cigarette taxes to help to pay for the health care bills of people who are suffering from tobacco-related illnesses. And I don't want to see the Congress and the Federal Government crowd that out. So when I proposed a tobacco tax before, it was to pay for health care. That's not going to happen this year.

Ms. Soren. Right now, advertising is written off as a business expense, and that means the public pays in some fashion for all advertising, including cigarette advertising. Would you consider getting rid of the tax deduction for cigarette advertising?

The President. You're the first person who's ever suggested it to me. I'd never thought of that. That's an interesting idea.

Ms. Soren. So I'll give you a few minutes to absorb it, and I'll come back.

The President. That's an interesting idea. I've never thought of that.

Ms. Soren. Because I think a lot of people would be offended by the idea of paying for an unhealthy product to advertise and garner more smokers through it. But I'll let you dwell on it.

Not only do you want to regulate tobacco products, but you're also in favor of regulating how they're marketed. And I was wondering, how far do you plan to go? When a musician sits down to talk with me and they're smoking a cigarette, should I not air that footage on MTV? Should I ask Keith Richards to put out his cigarette before he does an interview with me? Should this go for all television? Because of lot of young people watch MTV.

The President. I think that's a decision for you to make. I think you should ask him to put it out because I think there are a lot of young people—

Ms. Soren. It is Keith Richards.

The President. I know. [Laughter] And I know he's an icon—for me, too.

Ms. Soren. I don't know if he—his heart might stop if he doesn't have a cigarette.

The President. That's the great thing about their endurance, you know.

But that's a decision that each network, each interviewer, they'll have to make. Let me just say this: I believe very strongly in the first amendment and the right to free speech, free association, and freedom of religion. I believe in a very broad interpretation of it. But I believe that we should be restricting advertising directed at children because it's illegal to sell cigarettes to children. So, therefore, if it's illegal to sell cigarettes to children, it can't be illegal to stop the advertising directed at children. So that's what my focus is.

In terms of the interviews and everything, I would hope every American adult, even those who smoke, would think, as I had to when I became President and I had this occasional bad habit of having my cigar once in a while, I would hope they would think about not doing it in public, not doing it around children, not setting a bad example. I think we adults have a responsibility to try to set a good standard for our young people and to basically say everybody's got a lot of problems, but being self-destructive is not a way to deal with them.

Ms. Soren. Mr. President, I want to say this as politely as I can, but I think a lot of our viewers are going to be wondering why should they listen to you about this issue?

The President. Well, they don't have to listen to me about this issue. What we're going to do is change the law. But I'll tell you why they should listen to me or to anybody else. I would say that if they wanted to listen to me, don't listen to me, look at the medical research, look at the evidence. This is about their lives, not mine. I've lived most of my life. Their lives are ahead of them. And the reason they should listen to me is that the evidence is on my side, not just because I'm President. We know that nicotine in cigarettes and smokeless tobacco is addictive, is destructive, and will shorten the lives of one out of three people who start smoking on a regular basis. We know that.

So what they should do is say, "Okay, here's the evidence; now, what kind of life do I want to live?" Ultimately, it's going to be their decision, because even if the law keeps cigarettes away from them in the near-term, soon they'll turn 18, and they'll be able to do whatever they want to do. They have to make these decisions. But I think—my job, what I'm trying to do here every day and with the economy, with saving the college loan program, with trying to preserve the environment from this awful assault that the Congress is making on it, is to give the young people of our country a good country to grow up into and a good life to look forward to. Then they have to make a decision about how to live that life.

And what those of us who are older are supposed to do is to say here's what we think will maximize your choices. Here's what we think will give you the chance to live up to the fullest of your abilities. And that's what I hope they'll listen to, because the evidence is on my side. I'm not just preaching here, I have all this evidence.

Ms. Soren. Right. Right. It's not like you don't have enough things to do already.

The President. But this is a big deal. Look, look. Everything I try to do here, if you look at—let's just take trying to save the college loan program from attack and trying to preserve the environmental protections we have in this country. Why would I do that? Because I want my child and our grandchildren and all the young people coming up to enjoy a good life. That still requires all these individuals who are watching us to

make decisions about how they're going to live. And being addicted to tobacco is not a smart thing to do if you want to have a long, full good life. It's a huge roll of the dice.

I never will forget a few years ago having to speak at the funeral of a very close friend of mine, a man that had literally no other vices. He was one of the most perfect human beings I ever knew. But he smoked a couple of packs of cigarettes a day, and he died of lung cancer 2½ years after he had his last cigarette because it takes that long to clean out your lungs.

Ms. Soren. Wow.

The President. And he was younger than me. I never got over it. I never will get over it.

Abortion

Ms. Soren. While I have you, there are a couple of other issues I wanted to ask you about that are important to young voters, in addition to smoking and their health, which you sort of rattled off very quickly.

First, though, the woman best known as Jane Roe whose struggle to obtain an abortion led to the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, has come out against anything but first trimester abortions. How big a blow do you feel this is to the prochoice movement?

The President. Well, as I understand it, she's gone through a number of changes in her life and had a serious religious conversion and believes that abortion is wrong now. The rule of *Roe v. Wade* is it permits everybody in America to make that same decision. That is, I think there are too many abortions in America. I have always believed that abortion should be rare but that they should be safe and legal until the third trimester when the child can live outside the mother's womb. If somebody hasn't made the decision by then, unless the life of the mother's in danger, I think they should be illegal, and they were in my State.

But I think that leaving the decision to the woman and her doctor and whoever else she wishes to consult, I think on balance is still the right decision in our country. And that makes it possible for people like this woman to make up her own mind and to have her own convictions and then try to persuade

other people that she's right. It leaves her free to say, "My religious conviction is what is right for all of you; I hope you will follow me." People can do that.

And we have a very vibrant, as you know, pro-life movement in this country of people trying to convince other people of that all the time. But we don't say to people who disagree that we're going to criminalize your conduct until the child can live outside the mother's womb. And I think, on balance, that is the right position for our country, and I would stick with it.

Ms. Soren. Since abortion is under such attack in Congress, do you think that you should be doing more to support the prochoice movement?

The President. Well, I don't know what else I can do. I'm doing—I think I'm doing everything I can. I certainly have made it absolutely clear where I stand. I have resisted the attempts in the Congress to take away the rights of choice to women in the service, to women who work for the Federal Government.

There is a wholesale assault on the right to choose going on in the Congress now in all kinds of little, indirect ways. And I hope we can beat it back because I think it's—I don't think that's the right thing to do. I don't think the law here is the way to resolve all these problems.

Opposition in Congress

Ms. Soren. You've used executive actions in the first 2 years of your Presidency for issues like abortion. And in recent months, with the Republican majority, you've turned to them more frequently, the regulation of teenage smoking being the most recent one. Do you feel like you're subverting the will of Congress by tackling issues this way?

The President. No. I think that I probably should have been doing more of this all along. But in the first 2 years, I had to pour all of my energies into trying to do something to bring the deficit down, to invest more in education, to try to expand trade, and get the economy going again. And we were able to do that, but the voters still gave the Congress to the Republicans. And now it frees me up, in a way, to—most of my efforts, to try to keep them from undoing the gains we

have made from wrecking an economic strategy or wrecking the education program or wrecking the environment.

But I can now do things like use my executive authority, for example, to promote welfare reform in all 50 States, to do the other things that we talked about. So I think I probably should have been doing more of it all along.

Legal Defense Fund

Ms. Soren. Today lawyers for the legal defense fund are announcing how much money they've raised. Does that make you feel awkward to have them up there saying, "We've collected this money for the President to defend him?"

The President. No. I mean, it's a little—I wish it weren't necessary. But I'm not a wealthy person and my adversaries decided that they would try to embroil me in all kinds of legal things, and I can't afford to take any time off to think about it. So they're dealing with it the best they can in a legal and appropriate way. And I did not want to go to a few wealthy people and ask them to spend a ton of money to pay all my legal bills. So we resolved that the most appropriate thing to do would be to raise funds in a legal defense fund that had the same financial restrictions that running for Federal office does. And so that's what we've tried to do.

Bosnia

Ms. Soren. Senator Dole and Senator Helms have proposed asking for \$100 million in arms aid for Bosnia. Do you support this legislation?

The President. Not now because the arms embargo is on. My position is that the United States should not, by ourselves, violate the U.N. rule against selling arms into Bosnia because it applies to all Yugoslavia, that instead, what we ought to do is have that U.N. mission there work to stop aggression against Bosnia by letting NATO use its air power and by strengthening the U.N. mission on the ground.

What happened in Srebrenica was awful. But it happened in large measure because the United Nations would not permit the United States and the other NATO allies to take strong action from the air against the

Serbs. Now that there's been a real change on the ground and the Serbs have been rolled back in the western part of Bosnia and in Croatia by the Croats, I hope we have a chance to make a decent peace there.

I would not be against—if the U.N. mission fails, I would be for selling arms to the Bosnians or making it possible for the Bosnians to buy arms, but only when we get everybody to lift the arms embargo at the U.N.

But let me just say this in closing. We have an embargo against Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and you see what happened. We put a lot of pressure on it; we now have some defectors coming over, weakening his power. If we say, "We're going to ignore you, and we're going to sell arms to the Bosnians," then what's to prevent other countries from saying, "Okay, we'll ignore the U.N. embargo in Iraq, and we'll bolster Saddam Hussein?"

Rap Music

Ms. Soren. I just have two more quick questions. Do you think it's a good thing that Time-Warner wants to sell Interscope Records? Do you know anything about that?

The President. No.

Death of Jerry Garcia

Ms. Soren. I wanted to ask you if you were—well, Jerry Garcia has affected millions of Americans.

The President. Me, too.

Q. Were you a fan? Have you ever been to a Grateful Dead show? And why do you think he affected so many people of different backgrounds and generations?

The President. Well, first of all, he was just a great talent. I mean, he was really—he was a genius. And I was really pleased to see the Grateful Dead have one more great run around the country, you know, in the last couple of years and see all these young teenagers gravitating to a group that all of us liked 20 or more years ago. He had a great gift. And he even wound up putting out that line of ties. He had great ties. I would go around wearing Jerry Garcia ties and giving them away to people. So I was very sad when he died.

But he also had a terrible problem that was a legacy of the life he lived and the demons he dealt with. And I would hope that all of us who loved his music and valued his contributions would also reflect on the consequences of, again, really self-destructive behavior. I mean, the lesson of Jerry Garcia's life is that he made a great contribution and he really was a—he had at least two generations of Deadheads, you know.

Ms. Soren. Is Chelsea a fan at all? Has she ever gone to a show?

The President. Yes, very much. But she and I were talking—we had a long talk about it the other day, right before I left to come to the office. She called me on the phone. She's out of town, and she called me on the phone, and we were talking about it. And she was talking about all the kids in her school who are great fans of Jerry Garcia, and we had a long talk about it.

But I would hope that as we mourn him and sort of feel grateful for what he did, we also—young people should say, "I'm not going to die that way. I'm not going to die in a clinic with a drug addiction. I'm not going to do it." You don't have to have a destructive lifestyle to be a genius and make a contribution. You don't have to do that.

Cigarette Advertising

Ms. Soren. Any thoughts on the advertising, cigarette advertising being a tax deduction?

The President. I'll look into it. It's an interesting idea. Nobody ever even raised it to me before. Maybe you should be here making public policy. That's great.

Ms. Soren. I don't think so. I think I'm quite busy. I wouldn't want your job.

The President. Thanks.

NOTE: The interview began at 11 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Rolling Stone band member Keith Richards; the late Grateful Dead band member Jerry Garcia; and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Remarks Announcing a Comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Test Ban

August 11, 1995

Good afternoon. Today I am announcing my decision to negotiate a true zero yield comprehensive test ban. This is an historic milestone in our efforts to reduce the nuclear threat to build a safer world. The United States will now insist on a test ban that prohibits any nuclear weapons test explosion or any other nuclear explosion. I am convinced this decision will speed the negotiations so that we can achieve our goal of signing a comprehensive test ban next year.

As a central part of this decision, I am establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States will enter into a comprehensive test ban. These safeguards will strengthen our commitments in the areas of intelligence monitoring and verification, stockpile stewardship, maintenance of our nuclear laboratories, and test readiness.

They also specify the circumstances under which I would be prepared, in consultation with Congress, to exercise our supreme national interest rights under a comprehensive test ban to conduct necessary testing if the safety or reliability of our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified.

As a part of this arrangement I am today directing the establishment of a new annual reporting and certification requirement that will ensure that our nuclear weapons remain safe and reliable under a comprehensive test ban.

I appreciate the time, the energy, and the wisdom that the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Energy; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Directors of Central Intelligence and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have all devoted to the review of this crucial national security issue over the last several months.

American leaders since Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have believed a comprehensive test ban would be a major stride toward stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Now, as then, such a treaty would greatly strengthen the security of the United States and nations throughout the world. But

now, unlike then, such a treaty is within our reach.

It would build upon the successes we have achieved so far: Securing a permanent extension of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty; freezing North Korea's nuclear program; cutting existing nuclear arsenals by putting the START I Treaty into force; persuading Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan to give up their nuclear weapons and to reach agreements with Russia that now mean that both our nations no longer target our missiles at each other.

A comprehensive test ban is the right step as we continue pulling back from the nuclear precipice, a precipice which we began to live with 50 years ago this week. It moves us one step closer to the day when no nuclear weapons are detonated anywhere on the face of the Earth.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:05 p.m., in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Statement on a Comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Test Ban

August 11, 1995

One of my administration's highest priorities is to negotiate a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT) to reduce the danger posed by nuclear weapons proliferation. To advance that goal and secure the strongest possible treaty, I am announcing today my decision to seek a zero yield CTBT. A zero yield CTBT would ban any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion immediately upon entry into force. I hope it will lead to an early consensus among all states at the negotiating table.

Achieving a CTBT was a goal of both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. Now, as then, such a treaty would greatly strengthen U.S. and global security and create another barrier to nuclear proliferation and nuclear weapons development. At the conclusion of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference in May, all parties to that treaty agreed to work to complete a CTBT no later than 1996. Today, I want to reaffirm our commitment to do everything possible to conclude the CTBT negotiations as soon

as possible so that a treaty can be signed next year.

As part of our national security strategy, the United States must and will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.

I am assured by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of our nuclear weapons labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program without nuclear testing. I directed the implementation of such a program almost 2 years ago, and it is being developed with the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program will now be tied to a new certification procedure. In order for this program to succeed, both the administration and the Congress must provide sustained bipartisan support for the stockpile stewardship program over the next decade and beyond. I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure this support.

While I am optimistic that the stockpile stewardship program will be successful, as President I cannot dismiss the possibility, however unlikely, that the program will fall short of its objectives. Therefore, in addition to the new annual certification procedure for our nuclear weapons stockpile, I am also establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States can enter into a CTBT.

In the event that I were informed by the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Energy—advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command—that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapons type which the two Secretaries consider to be critical to our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, I would be prepared, in consultation with Congress, to exercise our “supreme national in-

terests” rights under the CTBT in order to conduct whatever testing might be required. Exercising this right, however, is a decision I believe I or any future President will not have to make. The nuclear weapons in the United States arsenal are safe and reliable, and I am determined our stockpile stewardship program will ensure they remain so in the absence of nuclear testing.

I recognize that our present monitoring systems will not detect with high confidence very low yield tests. Therefore, I am committed to pursuing a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.

Thirty-two years ago, President Kennedy called the completion of the Limited Test Ban Treaty in Moscow a “shaft of light cut into the darkness” of the cold war. With it, he said, the Nation could “step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace.” We did, and the world is a safer place because of it. I believe that we are ready to take the next step and lead the world to a comprehensive test ban. This would be a fitting tribute to all those, Republicans and Democrats, who have worked for a CTBT over the past four decades.

NOTE: A fact sheet on arms control and non-proliferation and a fact sheet on comprehensive test ban treaty safeguards were attached to the statement.

Statement on Vetoing Legislation To Lift the Arms Embargo Against Bosnia

August 11, 1995

I am announcing today my decision to veto legislation that would unilaterally lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I know that Members of Congress share my goals of reducing the violence in Bosnia and working to end the war. But their vote to unilaterally lift the arms embargo is the wrong step at the wrong time. The American people should understand the consequences of such action for our Nation and for the people of Bosnia.

- First, our allies have made clear that they will withdraw their troops from

Bosnia if the United States unilaterally lifts the arms embargo. The United States, as the leader of the NATO Alliance, would be obliged to send thousands of American ground troops to assist in that difficult operation.

- Second, lifting the embargo now could cause the fighting in Bosnia to escalate. The Serbs will not delay their assaults while the Bosnian Government receives new arms and training. Getting humanitarian aid to civilians will only get harder.
- Third, unilaterally lifting the embargo will lead to unilateral American responsibility. If the Bosnian Government suffered reverses on the battlefield, we, and not the Europeans, would be expected to fill the void with military and humanitarian aid.
- Fourth, intensified fighting in Bosnia would risk provoking a wider war in the heart of Europe.
- Fifth, for this bill to become law now would undercut the new diplomatic effort we are currently engaged in, and withdrawal of the United Nations mission would virtually eliminate chances for a peaceful, negotiated settlement in the foreseeable future.
- Finally, unilateral lift would create serious divisions between the United States and its key allies, with potential long-lasting damage to the NATO Alliance.

This is an important moment in Bosnia. Events in the past few weeks have opened new possibilities for negotiations. We will test these new realities, and we are now engaged with our allies and others in using these opportunities to settle this terrible war by agreement. This is not the time for the United States to pull the plug on the U.N. mission.

There is no question that we must take strong action in Bosnia. In recent weeks, the war has intensified. The Serbs have brutally assaulted three of the United Nations safe areas. Witnesses report widespread atrocities: summary executions, systematic rape, and renewed ethnic cleansing in Bosnia. Tens of thousands of innocent women and children have fled their homes. And now the Croatian army offensive has created new

dangers and dramatically increased the need for humanitarian aid to deal with displaced citizens in the region. But these events also create opportunities.

Along with our allies we have taken a series of strong steps to strengthen the United Nations mission, to prevent further attacks on safe areas, and to protect innocent civilians:

- NATO has decided it will counter an assault on the remaining safe areas with sustained and decisive use of air power. Our response will be broad, swift, and severe, going far beyond the narrow attacks of the past.
- For the first time, military commanders on the ground in Bosnia have been given operational control over such actions, paving the way for fast and effective NATO response.
- And well-armed British and French troops are working to ensure access to Sarajevo for convoys carrying food, medicine, and other vital supplies.

Despite these actions, many in Congress are ready to close the books on the U.N. mission. But I am not—not as long as that mission is willing and able to be a force for peace once again.

I recognize that there is no risk-free way ahead in Bosnia. But unilaterally lifting the arms embargo will have the opposite effects of what its supporters intend. It would intensify the fighting, jeopardize diplomacy, and make the outcome of the war in Bosnia an American responsibility.

Instead, we must work with our allies to protect innocent civilians, to strengthen the United Nations mission, to bring NATO's military power to bear if our warnings are defied, and to aggressively pursue the only path that will end the conflict, one that leads to a negotiated peace.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest an-

nounced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

August 5

In the morning, the President met with families who have benefited from the Family and Medical Leave Act at the Children's Inn at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD.

August 7

In the morning, the President met with Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker of Luxembourg.

In the afternoon, the President had telephone conversations with Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom, President Jacques Chirac of France, and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany to discuss the situation in Bosnia.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kumiki Gibson to the Council of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

August 8

The White House announced that the President has invited President Ion Iliescu of Romania to Washington for a working visit on September 26.

August 9

In the morning, the President met with foreign policy advisers to discuss the situation in Bosnia. He then traveled to Charlotte, NC.

In the afternoon, the President participated in a roundtable discussion on teen health issues at the Teen Health Connection. Later in the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Kevin G. Chavers to serve as President of the Government National Mortgage Association at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gail Clements McDonald to be the Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation at the Department of Transportation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Phillip A. Singerman to be the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development at the Commerce Depart-

ment's Economic Development Administration.

The President announced his intention to nominate Isaac C. Hunt, Jr., and Norman S. Johnson to be members of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gov. Ned R. McWherter to the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gov. Mel Carnahan to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation.

The President announced his intention to appoint Ernest Lofton, Jr., as a member of the Community Adjustment and Investment Program Advisory Committee for the North American Development Bank.

The President announced his intention to appoint Patricia M. Duff to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint Richard J. Boxer to the National Cancer Advisory Board.

August 10

The President announced his intention to nominate David C. Williams to be Inspector General of the Social Security Administration.

The President declared a major disaster in the State of Florida and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by Hurricane Erin on August 2-3.

The White House announced that the President will travel to Japan on November 16-21 to participate in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation leaders meeting and for a state visit.

**Nominations
Submitted to the Senate**

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Services Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted August 8

Isaac C. Hunt, Jr.,
of Ohio, to be a member of the Securities
and Exchange Commission for the term ex-
piring June 5, 2000, vice Richard Y. Roberts,
resigned.

Norman S. Johnson,
of Utah, to be a member of the Securities
and Exchange Commission for the term ex-
piring June 5, 1999, vice Mary L. Schapiro.

Ned R. McWherter,
of Tennessee, to be a Governor of the U.S.
Postal Service for the term expiring Decem-
ber 8, 2002, vice Robert Setrakian, term ex-
pired.

Phillip A. Singerman,
of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary
of Commerce, vice William W. Ginsberg, re-
signed.

Submitted August 10

Joseph Francis Baca,
of New Mexico, to be a member of the Board
of Directors of the State Justice Institute for
a term expiring September 17, 1998 (re-
appointment).

Bruce D. Black,
of New Mexico, to be U.S. District Judge
for the District of New Mexico, vice Juan
Guerrero Burciaga, retired.

D.W. Bransom, Jr.,
of Texas, to be U.S. Marshall for the North-
ern District of Texas for the term of 4 years,
vice W. Bruce Beaty.

David Allen Brock,
of New Hampshire, to be a member of the
Board of Directors of the State Justice Insti-
tute for a term expiring September 17, 1997
(reappointment).

Chester A. Crocker,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member
of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Insti-
tute of Peace for a term expiring January 19,
1999 (reappointment).

Hal C. DeCell III,
of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary
of Housing and Urban Development, vice
William J. Gilmartin.

Susan J. Dlott,
of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the
Southern District of Ohio, vice S. Arthur
Spiegel, retired.

Theodore M. Hesburgh,
of Indiana, to be a member of the Board
of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace
for a term expiring January 19, 1999 (re-
appointment).

Elizabeth K. Julian,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of
Housing and Urban Development, vice Ro-
berta Achtenberg, resigned.

Max M. Kampelman,
of the District of Columbia, to be a Member
of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Insti-
tute of Peace for a term expiring January 19,
1999 (reappointment).

Hugh Lawson,
of Georgia, to be U.S. District Judge for the
Middle District of Georgia, vice Wilbur D.
Owens, Jr., retired.

Zell Miller,
of Georgia, to be a member of the Board
of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial
Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring
November 6, 1995, vice Carroll A. Campbell,
Jr., term expired.

Zell Miller,
of Georgia, to be a member of the Board
of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial
Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring
November 6, 2001 (reappointment).

Frank Policaro, Jr.,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Marshal for the
Western District of Pennsylvania for the
term of 4 years, vice Eugene V. Marzullo.

Eli J. Segal,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the
Board of Directors of the Corporation for
National and Community Service for the re-
mainder of the term expiring February 8,
1999, vice James A. Joseph.

Hilda G. Tagle,
of Texas, to be U.S. District Judge for the
Southern District of Texas (new position).

Kim McLane Wardlaw,
of California, to be U.S. District Judge for
the Central District of California, vice David
V. Kenyon, retired.

E. Richard Webber,
of Missouri, to be U.S. District Judge for the
Eastern District of Missouri, vice Edward L.
Filippine, retired.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office
of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as
items nor covered by entries in the Digest of
Other White House Announcements.

Released August 5

Announcement on amendments to FY 1996
appropriations requests for the Department
of Energy

Released August 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Sec-
retary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry
on the President's telephone conversations
with Prime Minister John Major of the Unit-
ed Kingdom, President Jacques Chirac of
France, and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Ger-
many

Released August 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Sec-
retary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Environ-
mental Protection Agency Administrator
Carol Browner on environmental protection

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry
on the annual report to Congress on Foreign
Economic Collection and Industrial Espio-
nage

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry
on the upcoming working visit of President
Ion Iliescu of Romania on September 26

Released August 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Sec-
retary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry
on human rights violations committed by
Bosnian-Serb forces

Announcement of nomination for a U.S.
Marshal for the Northern District of Texas

Announcement of nomination for a U.S.
Marshal for the Western District of Penn-
sylvania

Released August 10

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry
on the President's upcoming visit to Asia on
November 16–21 to participate in the APEC
leaders meeting

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary
of Health and Human Services Donna
Shalala and Food and Drug Administrator
David Kessler on proposed regulations on
teenage smoking

Released August 11

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Sec-
retary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Special As-
sistant to the President for Defense Policy
Robert Bell

Announcement of nomination for six U.S.
District Court judges

Fact sheet on comprehensive test ban treaty
safeguards

Fact sheet on arms control and nonprolifera-
tion

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were
received by the Office of the Federal Register
during the period covered by this issue.